

Joseph H. Schneider, Nortonville.  
Robert J. Pafford, Salina.  
Elton L. Pounds, Smith Center.

## MAINE

Louis A. White, Eastport.  
David F. Kelley, Gardiner.  
Archie R. King, Saco.

## MINNESOTA

Marie H. Sands, Alvarado.  
Ove H. Voigt, Dent.  
Edward A. Buckley, East Grand Forks.  
Herman J. Ricker, Freeport.  
Lester A. Helweg, Fulda.  
Bertha T. Bot, Ghent.  
Charles B. Seipp, Hanley Falls.  
Irene G. Almquist, Harris.  
Michael E. Tompkins, Hector.  
William V. Kane, International Falls.  
Jacob Ohlsen, Luverne.  
Byron B. Maddy, McGregor.  
James V. Sweeney, Mahanomen.  
Robert E. O'Donnell, Mound.  
Justin I. Brown, Nevis.  
Raymond A. Linnihan, Red Lake Falls.  
William H. Wilson, Rushmore.  
Edward M. Swanson, Russell.  
Herman E. Kent, Sanborn.  
Julia B. Anderson, Zumbrota.

## MISSISSIPPI

Frederick J. Fugitt, Booneville.  
Minnie L. Beall, Lexington.  
James C. Edwards, Pontotoc.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gustave A. Lancix, Gonic.  
Raymond J. Carr, Lancaster.  
Elizabeth J. Varney, Littleton.

## NEW JERSEY

Thomas C. Stewart, Atlantic City.  
Emma E. Hyland, Camden.  
John F. O'Toole, Cliffside Park.  
Edward J. Shea, Rochelle Park.  
Joseph M. Carson, Trenton.

## NEW YORK

John L. Mack, Gasport.  
David J. Fitzgerald, Jr., Glens Falls.  
W. Armand Downes, Hilton.  
Charles A. Denegar, Madalin.  
Arthur J. Belgard, Ogdensburg.  
Thomas F. Connolly, Port Chester.  
James Arthur Egan, Sherrill.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Julius C. Pfeifer, Richardton.  
John A. Corrigan, Stanley.  
Clifton G. Foye, Steele.  
Howard W. Miller, Werner.  
Bernhard Ottis, Wyndmere.

## OKLAHOMA

Orly D. Moreland, Freedom.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Mabel G. Collins, Austin.  
George R. Meek, Bellefonte.  
George Ramsey, Cheltenham.  
Dorothy C. Feighner, Colver.  
Ione B. Middaugh, Dingmans Ferry.  
James H. Sinclair, Falls Creek.  
George W. Smith, Mauch Chunk.  
Kate H. Haydon, Midland.  
Samuel B. Miller, Mifflinburg.  
George E. Lay, Monaca.  
Roy Peiffer, Mount Gretna.  
Sylvester L. Rothenberger, Oley.  
Perry A. Tschop, Red Lion.

Howard O. Boyer, Rural Valley.  
John L. Considine, Sharon.  
John A. Maurer, Tremont.  
Maurice J. McGee, Troy.  
David C. Chamberlin, Turbotville.  
Lincoln G. Nyce, Vernfield.  
John M. Braden, Washington.  
Edward L. Middleswarth, Yeagertown.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert L. Plaxico, Clinton.

## TENNESSEE

LaVerne Gearhiser, Big Sandy.  
Hallie L. Davidson, Daisy.  
Irene Miller, La Follette.  
George S. Wilson, McMinnville.  
Ferd B. Cowan, White Pine.  
Gaston H. Rhodes, Whiteville.

## TEXAS

Richard P. Park, Aransas Pass.  
George R. Kocurek, Caldwell.  
Albert P. Hinton, Columbus.  
John H. Jones, Dickinson.  
Marvin B. Smith, Farmersville.  
Mildred H. Freeman, Freer.  
William C. Allen, Hearne.  
DeLouise M. Beall, Jacksonville.  
George H. Boynton, Hamilton.  
Percy L. Walker, Luling.  
William H. Wentland, Manor.  
Mary E. Pennington, Matagorda.  
Loyal N. Tyer, Mount Belvieu.  
Lemuel O. Robbins, Raymondville.  
Frank Clark, Rockwall.  
Alejo C. Garcia, San Diego.  
Albert G. Lee, Sweetwater.  
Pearson P. Pollard, Waskom.

## VIRGINIA

Ruth K. Northington, Lacrosse.  
John P. Kelly, Pennington Gap.  
Pauline H. Duncan, Riverton.

## REJECTION

*Executive nomination rejected by the Senate August 2, 1939*

## POSTMASTER

## MICHIGAN

Arthur A. Weng to be postmaster at Daggett, in the State of Michigan.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Supreme Ruler of the Universe, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, we thank Thee for this day which has come as a sacred gift from Thy hand, bringing with it tasks worthy of the investment and consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

We pray that there may be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life, when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

Wilt Thou share Thine eternal wisdom with these Thy servants? In all difficult problems give unto them that faith which casts out fear, that hope which never despairs, and that love which lays hold of Him whose resources are inexhaustible.

May we strive to be coworkers with Thee in ushering in that glad and glorious day when humanity's needs shall be

supplied and men everywhere shall seek to gather those blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

In the name of the Christ, our Friend and Elder Brother, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 543. An act for the relief of Imogene Enley;
- H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Bessie Bear Robe;
- H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of William H. Keesey;
- H. R. 1881. An act for the relief of Anne Boice;
- H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Ada Fuller;
- H. R. 2178. An act to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936;
- H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of G. E. Williams;
- H. R. 2610. An act for the relief of G. W. Netterville;
- H. R. 2642. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2738. An act providing for the disposition of certain Klamath Indian tribal funds;
- H. R. 2750. An act to prohibit the issuance and coinage of certain commemorative coins, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2875. An act to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter;
- H. R. 2883. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act;
- H. R. 2971. An act for the relief of certain Indians of the Winnebago Agency;
- H. R. 2990. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended;
- H. R. 3025. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214-15);
- H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Violet Dewey;
- H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Franklin Lopez, administrator of the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Alice C. Lopez, deceased;
- H. R. 3215. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 536);
- H. R. 3337. An act for the relief of the estate of Arthur Weltner;
- H. R. 3345. An act for the relief of the Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.;
- H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of J. Aristide Lefevre;
- H. R. 3795. An act to provide a right-of-way through the Chilkoot Barracks Military Reservation, Alaska;
- H. R. 4008. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of Labor;
- H. R. 4100. An act to amend the naturalization laws in relation to an alien previously admitted into the United States for permanent residence and who is temporarily absent from the United States solely in his or her capacity as a regularly ordained clergyman or representative of a recognized religious denomination or religious organization existing in the United States;
- H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of W. C. and James Latane, and Willie Johnson;

H. R. 4261. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank M. Smith;

H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Corabell Wuensch, Jackie Lee Wuensch, and Mary Rainbolt;

H. R. 4306. An act to make the United States Coast Guard Academy library a public depository for Government publications;

H. R. 4434. An act to provide for the abatement of personal taxes from insolvent building associations in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4609. An act for the relief of Charles Enslow;

H. R. 4638. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the eradication and control of the pink bollworm, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4732. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George M. Corriveau;

H. R. 4733. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Laura T. Corriveau;

H. R. 4742. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chalmette National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4783. An act to provide a right-of-way;

H. R. 4784. An act to provide a right-of-way;

H. R. 4847. An act for the relief of Leland J. Belding;

H. R. 4983. An act to amend sections 712, 802, and 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to the requisitioning of vessels;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of Nicholas Contopoulos;

H. R. 5450. An act to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed;

H. R. 5516. An act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter;

H. R. 5611. An act to amend section 9 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 817), entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5684. An act amending the act of Congress of June 25, 1938 (C. 710, 52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath Business Committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe;

H. R. 5743. An act for the relief of Walter C. Holmes;

H. R. 5764. An act to provide for the establishment of a cemetery within the Crab Orchard Creek Dam project, Williamson County, Ill.;

H. R. 5775. An act for the relief of Michael M. Cohen;

H. R. 5912. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Salt Lake City, Utah, to construct and maintain certain roads, streets, and boulevards across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation;

H. R. 5982. An act for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938 (Public Law No. 583, 75th Cong., 3d sess.);

H. R. 6114. An act to authorize postmasters within the Territory of Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6266. An act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.;

H. R. 6268. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make certain allowances for losses by leakage and evaporation upon withdrawal of packages of brandy or fruit spirits under certain conditions;

H. R. 6273. An act to exempt certain motorboats from the operation of sections 4 and 6 of the Motor Boat Act of June 9, 1910, and from certain other acts of Congress, and to provide that certain motorboats shall not be required to carry on board copies of the pilot rules;



H. R. 6320. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry;

H. R. 6405. An act authorizing the sale of certain real estate in the District of Columbia no longer required for public purposes;

H. R. 6528. An act to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6538. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6540. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6541. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6555. An act to amend the act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374), as amended, relating to the advance of funds in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs, so as to permit such advances in connection with the enforcement of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, and to permit advances of funds in connection with the enforcement of the customs laws;

H. R. 6585. An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of the Arkansas State Penitentiary;

H. R. 6872. An act to amend sections 4886, 4887, 4920, and 4929 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 31, 32, 69, and 73);

H. R. 6873. An act to amend sections 4904, 4909, 4911, and 4915 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 52, 57, 59a, and 63);

H. R. 6875. An act to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51);

H. R. 6899. An act granting pensions to certain veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 6925. An act to waive the age limit for appointment as second lieutenant, Regular Army, of certain persons now on active duty with the Air Corps;

H. R. 7086. An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7093. An act to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army;

H. R. 7263. An act to permit the importation free of duty of certain literature for distribution at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939;

H. R. 7288. An act to perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard by authorizing the commissioning, appointment, and enlistment in the Coast Guard of certain officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7320. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of the Columbian Fountain in Washington, D. C.;

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the delegation of certain authority within the Department of Agriculture;

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover;

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior deferring the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the San Carlos and Flathead Indian irrigation projects;

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the city of Gallipolis, Ohio;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals

against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution providing that the farmers' market in blocks 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia shall not be used for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Banks Business College;

H. R. 1693. An act to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood at or near Bean Lake in Platte County, and Sugar Lake in Buchanan County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions;

H. R. 2001. An act for the equalization of letter carriers;

H. R. 2452. An act for the relief of George Slade;

H. R. 2751. An act to repeal sections 3711, 3712, and 3713 of the Revised Statutes which relate to the purchase in the District of Columbia of coal and wood for public use, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2752. An act to include within the Kaniksu National Forest certain lands owned or in course of acquisition by the United States;

H. R. 3104. An act for the relief of Kyle Blair;

H. R. 3224. An act creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 3409. An act to amend the act of June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1516), authorizing the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4108. An act to provide for the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States;

H. R. 4260. An act for the relief of J. Milton Sweney;

H. R. 4322. An act giving clerks in the Railway Mail Service the benefit of holiday known as Armistice Day;

H. R. 4540. An act authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4938. An act to amend the act approved June 26, 1935, entitled "An act to create a national memorial military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5625. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling, and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5747. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest;

H. R. 6435. An act to authorize cancelation of deportation in the case of Louise Wohl;

H. R. 6479. An act amending section 2857 of the Distilled Spirits Act;

H. R. 6546. An act for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser;

H. R. 6614. An act to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act;

H. R. 6634. An act amending previous flood-control acts, and authorizing certain preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6747. An act relating to the retirement of employees to whom the provisions of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 763), as amended, apply;

H. R. 6874. An act to repeal section 4897 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 38), and amend sections

4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78);

H. R. 6878. An act to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37); and

H. R. 7270. An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act;

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 29. An act to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes;

S. 161. An act granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Nathan Kaplan;

S. 310. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

S. 419. An act for the relief of Luke A. Westenberger;

S. 538. An act for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida;

S. 628. An act to allow the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years;

S. 773. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all claims which the Yakima Indian Tribes may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 844. An act to simplify the accounts of the Treasurer of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 882. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain power-boat service in Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 1214. An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes;

S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938";

S. 1326. An act for the relief of Janet Hendel, nee Judith Shapiro;

S. 1510. An act for the relief of George Louis Artick;

S. 1617. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Chicouras;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Thermal Syndicate, Ltd.;

S. 1643. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for disability or death incurred in line of duty as a direct result of the conflict in the Far East;

S. 1710. An act to provide for the cancellation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board;

S. 1780. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property for the Antietam Battlefield site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act for the relief of the Eberhart Steel Products Co., Inc.;

S. 1802. An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Dionis Moldowan;

S. 1962. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to reopen and readjudicate the case of Carrie Howard Steedman and Eugenia Howard Edmunds;

S. 2030. An act for the relief of Mira Friedberg (Mira Dworecka);

S. 2046. An act to change the designations of the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland;

S. 2059. An act authorizing a grant to the city of Fargo, N. Dak., of an easement in connection with the construction of water and sewer systems;

S. 2141. An act to authorize acquisition of complete title to the Puyallup Indian Tribal School property at Tacoma, Wash., for Indian sanatorium purposes;

S. 2144. An act providing for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Navy of Lockwoods Basin, East Boston, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

S. 2201. An act for the relief of Alabama Lewis Poole;

S. 2209. An act for the relief of Earle Embrey;

S. 2210. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation;

S. 2212. An act to provide for the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities;

S. 2225. An act to create a new group within the Air Corps, Regular Army, with the designations of junior flight officer, flight officer, and senior flight officer;

S. 2261. An act for the relief of the Western or Old Settler Cherokees, and for other purposes;

S. 2270. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase refuge lands within the State of South Carolina for the perpetuation of the eastern wild turkey and to provide pure-blood brood stock for restocking within its native range, and for other purposes;

S. 2284. An act to amend the act of May 4, 1898 (30 Stat. 369), so as to authorize the President to appoint 100 acting assistant surgeons for temporary service;

S. 2295. An act authorizing the President to reappoint and honorably discharge David J. Sawyer, second lieutenant, National Army, as of May 11, 1919;

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Hubert Richardson;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Walter J. Hogan and W. R. Larkin, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho;

S. 2427. An act authorizing the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr.;

S. 2433. An act for the relief of Frank Casey;

S. 2464. An act to amend the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 505), as amended (49 Stat. 1926; 34 U. S. C., Supp. IV, 496; sec. 14 of Public, No. 18, 76th Cong.), to adjust the limitations on the profits of certain contractors with the United States;

S. 2492. An act for the relief of Dane Goich;

S. 2493. An act to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project, near Dumfries, Va., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act for the relief of James E. Barry;

S. 2527. An act for the relief of Mary Nouhan;

S. 2529. An act for the relief of the Bell Grocery Co.;

S. 2531. An act for the relief of Stanley Falk, Howard Franklin, Mrs. Nathan Falk, and Rose Winter;

S. 2560. An act for the relief of Marjorie Buchek;

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Ina Jones;

S. 2572. An act for the relief of Anna M. Shea;

S. 2578. An act to designate the lock and dam at Alton, Ill., as the Henry T. Rainey Dam;

S. 2598. An act for the relief of Kurt Wessely;

S. 2608. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Samuel Woodfill a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list;

S. 2609. An act to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana;

S. 2617. An act to authorize the leasing of the undeveloped coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma;

S. 2625. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or otherwise dispose of surplus animals inhabiting the national parks and national monuments, and for other purposes;

S. 2627. An act to empower and authorize special agents and such other employees of the Division of Investigations, Department of the Interior, as are designated by the Secretary of the Interior for that purpose, to administer oaths in the performance of their official duties;

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims;

S. 2682. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a special procedure for fixing minimum-wage rates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands;



S. 2689. An act to amend section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, and for other purposes;

S. 2709. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 2712. An act to amend section 2803 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

S. 2735. An act authorizing the issuance to Orville Wright of honorary aircraft pilot's certificate No. 1;

S. 2745. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases;

S. 2756. An act relating to the funeral costs and transportation of bodies of certain deceased veterans;

S. 2778. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924;

S. 2779. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," known as the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, approved February 27, 1929;

S. 2798. An act for the relief of Charles H. Parr;

S. 2843. An act granting easements on Indian lands of the Wind River or Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo., for dam site and reservoir purposes in connection with the Riverton reclamation project;

S. 2866. An act to provide for allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for examination and treatment;

S. 2867. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., for right-of-way purposes, a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Coatesville, Pa.;

S. 2893. An act to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution for the relief of Kam N. Kathju;

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of the feasibility and desirability of fixing railroad rates on the basis of zones;

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of Harley B. Ferguson as a major general, United States Army; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 28. An act to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.;

S. 808. An act for the relief of Calliope Minaca Pilavakis;

S. 1258. An act for the relief of the Rent-A-Car Co.;

S. 1954. An act for the relief of Joannes Josephus Citron;

S. 2056. An act for the relief of N. F. Clower and Elijah Williams;

S. 2410. An act relating to the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects with funds furnished by the Farm Security Administration;

S. 2562. An act to facilitate certain construction work for the Army, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the celebration to be held at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1939, in celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4998) entitled "An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 875) entitled "An act for the relief of Okie May Fegley."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) entitled "An act for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilic," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1269) entitled "An act for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1538) entitled "An act for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas)," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1654) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1911) entitled "An act for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas)," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. KING, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2271) entitled "An act for the relief of Barnet Warren," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO MAKE PERMISSIVE THE ACQUISITION OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER LAND OR INTERESTS IN LAND ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7293) to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make permissive the acquisition of legislative jurisdiction over land or interests in land acquired by the United States, with a committee amendment, and agree to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 733; title 34, sec. 520; title 40, sec. 255; and title 50, sec. 175) be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the words: "nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land or site may be, to such purchase, has been given," and by adding at the end of said section 355 the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the obtaining of exclusive jurisdiction in the United States over lands or interests therein which have been or shall hereafter be acquired by it shall not be required; but the head or other authorized officer of any department or independent establishment or agency of the Government may, in such cases and at such times as he may deem desirable, accept or secure from the State in which any lands or interests therein under his immediate jurisdiction, custody, or control are situated, consent to or cession of such jurisdiction, exclusive or partial, not theretofore obtained, over any such lands or interests as he may deem desirable and indicate acceptance of such jurisdiction on behalf of the United States by filing a notice of such acceptance with the Governor of such State or in such other manner

as may be prescribed by the laws of the State where such lands are situated. Unless and until the United States has accepted jurisdiction over lands hereafter to be acquired as aforesaid, it shall be conclusively presumed that no such jurisdiction has been accepted."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 733; title 34, sec. 520; title 40, sec. 255; and title 50, sec. 175) be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 355. No public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purposes of erecting thereon any armory, arsenal, fort, fortification, navy yard, custom-house, lighthouse, or other public building of any kind whatever, until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title. The district attorneys of the United States, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall furnish any assistance or information in their power in relation to the titles of the public property lying within their respective districts. And the secretaries of the departments, upon the application of the Attorney General, shall procure any additional evidence of title which he may deem necessary, and which may not be in the possession of the officers of the Government, and the expense of procuring it shall be paid out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the departments, respectively: *Provided, however,* That in all cases of the acquisition of land or any interest therein by the United States for the purposes herein specified or for other purposes, wherein the written opinion of the Attorney General in favor of the validity of the title of such land is or may be required or authorized by law, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, base such opinion upon a certificate of title of a title company. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the obtaining of exclusive jurisdiction in the United States over lands or interests therein which have been or shall hereafter be acquired by it shall not be required; but the head or other authorized officer or any department or independent establishment or agency of the Government may, in such cases and at such times as he may deem desirable, accept or secure from the State in which any lands or interests therein under his immediate jurisdiction, custody, or control are situated, consent to or cession of such jurisdiction, exclusive or partial, not theretofore obtained, over any such lands or interests as he may deem desirable and indicate acceptance of such jurisdiction on behalf of the United States by filing a notice of such acceptance with the Governor of such State or in such other manner as may be prescribed by the laws of the State where such lands are situated. Unless and until the United States has accepted jurisdiction over lands hereafter to be acquired as aforesaid, it shall be conclusively presumed that no such jurisdiction has been accepted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDMENT OF RETIREMENT ACT OF APRIL 23, 1904

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 839) to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 839) to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following immediately preceding the period at the end of the first paragraph of the Senate bill: "Provided, That the words 'or after forty years' service', contained in the Retirement Act of Congress, approved April 23, 1904, be changed to read: 'or after thirty years' service, including cadet service'; and be it further provided that the words 'otherwise than as a cadet' in the same Act be changed to read 'including cadet service'; and the House agree to the same.

A. J. MAY,  
R. E. THOMASON,  
W. G. ANDREWS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

MORRIS SHEPPARD,  
LISTER HILL,  
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 839) to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommend in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate bill extended the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904, to officers not above the grade of colonel who served in the War with Spain between April 21, 1898, and April 11, 1899. The House amendment limited the privileges of the Senate bill to officers not above the grade of colonel with not less than 30 years' service who served in the War with Spain between April 21, 1898, and April 11, 1899.

The conference report accomplishes the same result as the House amendment by specific amendment to the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904, except that provision is made for including cadet service in computing years of service.

A. J. MAY,  
W. G. ANDREWS,  
R. E. THOMASON,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFFER and Mr. MILLS of Arkansas asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a list of individuals and organizations endorsing the housing program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### DEDICATION OF THE 4-COUNTY ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to leave for home this afternoon. On next Friday I am to deliver an address at the dedication of the 4-County Electric Power Association in my district and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein copies of those proceedings, including my address.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I regret very much I have to leave. I understand he is going to break his long silence tomorrow and address the House for a minute and I am sorry I cannot be here to hear him. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that he made the statement some time ago that the only cost to the Government of inserting matters in the RECORD is the cost of the paper and the ink. I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement from the Public Printer showing that the statement the gentleman made some time ago referred to only a small part of the cost of printing these items. If the gentleman would like to have that put in at this point it would be enlightening.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection; I am always glad to be enlightened by the silent gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### FARMERS AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when the present administration came into power an expansion of Federal land-bank loans was started and the land-bank commissioner loans were brought into being. This Government promised the farmers that it would save their farms for them. Thousands and thousands of farmers in every State refinanced their farms because of promises made by their Government. The farmers were told, in the newspapers and over the radio, to apply for their loans, and prevent foreclosures, and they were further told that if they could not get their loans through, to write to the President. At the same time farmers were promised and assured that farm prices would be raised, so that they might ultimately save their land.

Farm prices are now at an all-time low. The spread between that which the farmer must pay for the things he buys and what he receives for his products has increased. As farm prices continue to decline, the Federal land bank and the land-bank commissioner are foreclosing upon farm homes by the hundreds and thousands. In one of my counties 10 such foreclosures were filed within 1 week.

This Congress should not adjourn without enacting legislation which will ease the burden of the farmers in their payments on both principal and interest on these loans, which they obligated themselves for upon the representations made by the Government. Deficiency judgments should be abolished in Federal land-bank and commissioner cases. Our benevolent Uncle Sam has become a loan shark.

This Congress should not adjourn until an amendment to the wage and hour law has been enacted to relieve the small telephone companies, agricultural labor, and the processors of agricultural products from compliance with that law. I, for one, am willing to stay here until this, as well as other much-needed legislation, has been enacted. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from the American Good Government Society and three tables prepared by them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the lumber industry and to include certain letters and excerpts from the Oregon Voter, and also a certain letter from Russell Scott, of Champoe, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'BRIEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper statement dealing with sugar production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two small letters from my home town.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include

therein a speech delivered by Judge Arthur Overmyer, a former Democratic Member from the Thirteenth District of Ohio concerning the Battle of Fort Stevens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE MARINE BAND

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the House Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously reported to the House a bill, H. R. 6942, authorizing the United States Marine Band to proceed to Rye, N. H., to participate in a memorial concert for the benefit of the dependents of the victims of the submarine *Squalus* disaster, which occurred on May 23 last. On July 13 the House unanimously passed that bill, after which it was referred to the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, where, insofar as I am able to ascertain, because of the unfriendliness of the chairman of that committee toward the proposal, it was permitted to languish and expire.

It is difficult for the people of New Hampshire, whose sympathy and concern poured out to the bereaved dependents of the unfortunate victims of the *Squalus* disaster, to understand the failure of this bill to be enacted into law by a Congress that can so lavishly and extravagantly expend billions of dollars but could not see through to a successful conclusion a measure that involved the expenditure of only \$3,100 for a most worthy and deserving cause. The people of New Hampshire are indeed grateful to the chairman, Mr. VINSON, and the members of the House Committee on Naval Affairs and to the Members of this House for their sympathetic and unanimous support of this effort to alleviate the burdens of the dependents of the *Squalus* victims. That the wishes of the membership of this body were disregarded and this worthy effort thwarted is a matter of deep regret.

#### FARMERS AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] made a few remarks a moment ago in which he deplored the condition of the farmer and the failure of the administration to help the farmer. I have just consulted the RECORD and find that on a rule which was before the House yesterday to consider a bill about 80 percent of the benefits of the particular measure going to the farmer, the gentleman from Nebraska is recorded as voting against the consideration of the legislation.

Now let us see what the RECORD discloses. The appropriations made by this Congress since January show we have appropriated \$1,206,369,412 for the Department of Agriculture.

I know some say, Do not charge the appropriation for the Weather Bureau or for roads to the farmer. Of course, not all of it should be charged to agriculture, but the RECORD further discloses that we appropriated \$300,000,000 more for agriculture than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Appropriations for agriculture, including roads and the Weather Bureau, today amount to more than it cost to run the entire Government when I first came to Washington.

What did the bill carry yesterday that not only the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], but all Republicans present, voted against considering? I list the items:

Public roads	\$500,000,000
Public Works Administration	350,000,000
Railroad equipment	250,000,000
Rural electrification	350,000,000
Department of Agriculture	400,000,000

The \$400,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture was to be used solely for rural-security projects, such as facilities for farm tenants, farm laborers, and sharecroppers, including rural rehabilitation loans, projects for the provision of addi-

tional water facilities, and farm-tenant loans, as provided in title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

I realize the bill as reported was not perfect. There were provisions to which I objected, especially the administrative features, and if the measure had been considered I would have endeavored to amend it, but I was willing that the House at least have an opportunity to consider it.

We hear about Congress asserting itself; that Members voted their individual judgment yesterday. Strange the Republicans' judgment in this instance, each and every one voting on the rule, was in accord. Talk about "rubber stamp" Democrats, could it be there were some "rubber stamp" Republicans in evidence yesterday?

How many who voted against considering this bill had read the bill? When the residents of the rural section find out what was in the bill, political fences will suffer, and many of their Representatives will be busy during the vacation period making repairs, if that be possible.

I realize that a number of Democrats joined with the Republicans on this vote. The President did not suffer as a result of the action of the House yesterday, but it was the laboring man, the farmer, and, in fact, the businessman. It cannot be denied that the bill as it came from the committee and the companion bill that passed the Senate is supremely a bill to aid the people of the rural areas, to aid farmers in their fight to hold and stay on their farms, and to secure the benefits of rural electrification. It proposes to accomplish these worldly results in a sound, financial way. There was no appeal to give or grant the money necessary to accomplish these things, but to loan the money in a sound way.

The bill would not only have aided the farmers and the people of rural areas but it would have aided laboring men and business generally by promoting work and the spending of money for the necessities of life.

Do not be fooled, such votes are not destroying President Roosevelt. On the contrary, he gains friends. The masses of the people for whom he has done so much rally to his defense, and that includes the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, a militant minority is a valuable asset in any legislative body—Federal, State, or local—but when that militant minority has but one objective—that of destruction of legislation advanced by the majority, regardless of its provisions—it becomes a menace to good government.

When the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress adjourns, analyze the record, find if you can where the Republican minority has advanced one constructive suggestion for legislation beneficial to recovery as a substitute for the bills the Democrats placed before the Congress.

When I return to my district I will report to my constituents that I have supported the President, as I promised I would do in the campaign of 1938.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND FINANCING OF SELF-LIQUIDATING PROJECTS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, now that we have slept over it and tried to think over the matter of yesterday, it is impossible to speak for the rest of you but I think it is a shame, a pity, that 47 members of the Democratic Party should unite with the Republicans to overthrow and defeat the mere bringing out of a Democratic rule to discuss and vote for a measure the whole purpose of which is to really help bring about recovery, so sadly needed; but we must congratulate the Republicans who stood in a firm phalanx and never a solitary one broke ranks. As to those Democrats, if they feel victorious this morning, I shall wait to see how they feel when we come back next January, having then met face to face the people who trusted them with their welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### TO PREVENT PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 105)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

Because there have been so many misrepresentations, some unpremeditated, some deliberate, in regard to the attitude of the executive branch of the Government in relation to Senate bill 1871, "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," and because a number of questions have been raised as to the meaning and application of some of its provisions, I deem it advisable at the time of Executive approval to make certain observations to the Congress of the United States.

The genesis of this legislation lies in the message of the President of January 5, 1939, respecting an additional appropriation for the Works Progress Administration. I said in that message: "It is my belief that improper political practices can be eliminated only by the imposition of rigid statutory regulations and penalties by the Congress, and that this should be done. Such penalties should be imposed not only upon persons within the administrative organization of the Works Progress Administration but also upon outsiders who have in fact in many instances been the principal offenders in this regard. My only reservation in this matter is that no legislation should be enacted which will in any way deprive workers on the Works Progress Administration program of the civil rights to which they are entitled in common with other citizens."

Furthermore, in applying to all employees of the Federal Government (with a few exceptions) the rules to which the civil-service employees have been subject for many years, this measure is in harmony with the policy that I have consistently advocated during all my public life, namely, the wider extension of civil service as opposed to its curtailment.

It is worth noting that nearly all exemptions from the civil service which have been made during the past six years and a half have originated in the Congress itself and not in the Executive.

Furthermore, it is well known that I have consistently advocated the objectives of the present bill. It has been currently suggested that partisan political reasons have entered largely into the passage of the bill, but with this I am not concerned, because it is my hope that if properly administered the measure can be made an effective instrument of good government.

As is usual with all bills passed by the Congress, this bill has been examined on its receipt at the Executive Office by the appropriate departments or agencies, in this case the Attorney General of the United States and the Civil Service Commission.

The Attorney General has advised me that it seems clear that the Federal Government has the power to prescribe as qualifications for its employees that they refrain from taking part in other endeavors which, in the light of common experience, may well consume time and attention required by their duties as public officials. He points out, however, that such qualifications cannot properly preclude Government employees from the exercise of the right of free speech or from their right to exercise the franchise.

The question of constitutionality being resolved in favor of the bill, our next inquiry relates to the exercise and preservation of these rights. It is obvious that the intent of the bill is to follow broadly the provisions of civil-service regulations that have existed for many years in regard to political activities of Federal employees.



It is because I have received and will continue to receive so many queries asking what a Government employee may or may not do that it seems appropriate at the outset to postulate the broad principle that if the bill is administered in accord with its spirit, and if it is in the future administered without abuse, oppression, or groundless fear, it will serve the purpose intended by the Congress.

For example, I have been asked by employees of the Government whether under this law they would lose their positions if they merely attend political meetings. The answer is, of course, no.

I have been asked whether they would lose their positions if they contributed voluntarily to party or individual campaign funds without being solicited. The answer is, of course no.

I have been asked whether they would lose their positions if they should merely express their opinion or preference publicly—orally, by radio, or in writing—without doing so as part of an organized political campaign. The answer is no.

I have been asked if citizens who have received loans from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, from the Farm Credit Administration or its subsidiaries, from the Farm Security Administration, from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government lending agencies, would be subject to the terms of this bill. The answer is no.

I have been asked whether farmers receiving farm benefits would be bound by the terms of the bill. Again the answer is no.

I have been asked if Government employees who belong to Young Republican Clubs, Young Democratic Clubs, Civil Service Reform Associations, the League of Women Voters, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and similar bodies are subject to the penalties of the measure because of mere membership in these organizations. The answer is no.

There will be hundreds of similar questions raised in the actual administration and enforcement of this bill. Such questions will be asked in most cases by individuals in good faith. And it is only fair that they should receive an answer. I am, therefore, asking the Attorney General to take the necessary steps through the new Civil Liberties unit of the Department of Justice in order that the civil rights of every Government employee may be duly protected, and that the element of fear may be removed.

I have been asked if the bill applies to veterans—Civil War, Indian wars, the War with Spain, the World War—retired officers and men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who, though not Government employees, are receiving benefits or pensions of one kind or another. The answer is, of course, no.

I have been asked if the act applies to those who get Government benefits under the Social Security Act in the form of old-age pensions or in the form of unemployment compensation. The answer is no.

Finally, I have been asked various questions relating to the right of a Government employee publicly to answer unwarranted attacks made on him or on his work or on the work of his superiors or on the work of his subordinates, notwithstanding the fact that such attacks or misrepresentations were made for political purposes by newspapers or by individuals as a part of a political campaign.

This raises the interesting question as to whether all Government officials except the President and Vice President, persons in the office of the President, heads and assistant heads of executive departments, and policy-determining officers appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate must remain mute if and when they or the work with which they are concerned is attacked and misrepresented in a political campaign or preliminary thereto.

It will be noted that the language of the bill wholly excludes members or employees of the legislative branch of the Government from its operation.

It can hardly be maintained that it is an American way of doing things to allow newspapers, magazines, radio broad-

casters, Members and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and all kinds of candidates for public office and their friends to make any form of charge, misrepresentation, falsification, or vituperation against the acts of any individual or group of individuals employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government with complete immunity against reply except by a handful of high executive officials. That, I repeat, would be un-American because it would be unfair, and the great mass of Americans like fair play and insist on it. They do not stand for any gag act.

It is, therefore, my considered opinion, in which the Attorney General of the United States joins me, that all Federal employees, from the highest to the lowest, have the right publicly to answer any attack or misrepresentation, provided, of course, they do not make such reply as part of active participation in political campaigns.

The same definition of fair and proper administration of the bill applies to the right of any Government employee, from the highest to the lowest, to give to the public factual information relating to the conduct of Government affairs. To rule otherwise would make it impossible for the people of the United States to learn from those who serve the Government vital, necessary, and interesting facts relating to the manifold activities of the Federal Government. To rule otherwise would give a monopoly, to originate and disseminate information to those who, primarily for political purposes, unfortunately have been given to the spreading of false information. That again is unfair and, therefore, un-American.

It is, I am confident, the purpose of the proponents of this legislation that the new law be thus administered so that the right of free speech will remain even to those who serve the Government; and that the Government itself shall have full right to place all facts in its possession before the public. If some future administration should undertake to administer this legislation to the detriment of these rights, such action would be contrary to the purpose of the act itself and might well infringe the constitutional rights of citizens. I trust that public vigilance will for all time prevent this.

The Attorney General calls my attention to a practical difficulty which should be corrected by additional legislation as soon as possible. For many years there has been an exception to the civil-service regulations whereby employees permanently residing in the District of Columbia or in municipalities adjacent thereto may become candidates for or hold municipal office in their municipalities. This and a few similar exceptions should, I believe, be maintained.

The other question relates to the fact that the bill does not in any way cover the multitude of State and local employees, who greatly outnumber Federal employees and who may continue to take part in elections in which there are candidates for Federal office on the same ballot with candidates for State and local office. It is held by many who have examined the constitutional question that because the Congress, under the Constitution, may maintain the integrity of Federal elections, it has the power to extend the objectives of this bill so as to cover State and local government employees who participate actively in Federal elections. This is at least worth the study of the Congress at its next session and therefore before the next Federal election.

It is because for so many years I have striven in public life and in private life for decency in political campaigns, both on the part of Government servants, of candidates, of newspapers, of corporations, and of individuals that I regard this new legislation as at least a step in the right direction.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1939.

#### THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR, 1939

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7462, Rept. No. 1439) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and

for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order.

#### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of his remarks yesterday the majority leader suggested, with reference to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that the RECORD should show sometimes how the gentleman from Pennsylvania has voted. I have checked up that situation. I find that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has voted against upward of \$15,000,000,000 of needless and useless appropriations which have been passed by the Congress, and that on yesterday he voted against the consideration of another measure to get this country into useless debt—\$1,950,000,000. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### FARM RELIEF

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that I cannot agree with him when he terms the pernicious spending bill rejected yesterday by the House as relief for agriculture. It will prove to be of great benefit and of real relief to the farmers of this Nation, as well as to all other business and industry in general, to realize that sanity has returned to the Hall of Congress, as evidenced by the action of the House yesterday. As an actual farmer myself, I want to compliment the gentleman from the State of Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who knows correctly the attitude of the farmer of America, and that attitude, my friends, gathered from direct association with the farmer, and not through roaming the streets of the city of St. Louis. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### LANDS FOR PUBLIC PARK IN THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and other public purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Nevada, upon the conditions and limitations hereinafter expressed, the following-described land of the United States in the State of Nevada, to be held and used by such State for the purposes of a State public park and recreational site and other public purposes:

Mount Diablo meridian: Commencing at the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 21 south, range 63 east, Mount Diablo meridian; thence east twenty-four thousand and twelve and twelve one-hundredths feet; thence north fifteen thousand eight hundred and forty feet; thence west eighteen thousand seven hundred and ninety-two and twelve one-hundredths feet to the intersection with the east line of section 1, township 21 south, range 63 east; thence south along said east line of section 1, to the northeast corner of section 12, township 21 south, range 63 east; thence west along the north line of said section 12, five thousand two hundred and eighty feet to the northwest corner of said section 12; thence south along the west side line of section 12 and the west side line of section 13 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 13, township 21 south, range 63 east; thence east to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 13; thence north to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 13; thence east along the north side line of said section 13 to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 13; thence south to the southwest corner of

the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 13; thence west to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 13; thence south to the southwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of said section 13; thence west to the northwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section 13; thence south along the west side line of section 13 and said section 24 to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of section 24; the point of commencement.

In the event the State shall fail to devote such lands to the purposes of a State public park and recreational site within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or fail to maintain such land as a public park and recreational site for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use, or devote such lands or any part thereof to other than public use, or shall fail within a reasonable time to authorize and put in effect and practice within said area any laws, rules, and regulations that are put in effect and practice by the Department of the Interior within the Boulder Canyon reclamation area relative to gambling, the sale of intoxicating liquors, water pollution, or sanitation, such land and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States; and in such event the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered to declare such a forfeiture of the grant, and to assume jurisdiction of such land for national-monument purposes under the act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225). Any patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the land patented: *Provided*, That such minerals so reserved shall be prospected for, mined, and removed only in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That no prospecting or mining on any portion of said area shall be permitted without the consent of the State Park Commission of the State of Nevada.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, beginning in line 12, after the word "of", strike out the remainder of the line and through line 4, on page 3 and insert "sections 12, 13, and 24, but specifically excluding the land in the area which is under private ownership."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 24, after the word "for", insert "national recreational area or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRUGHAM: On page 5, after line 5, insert: "Or if there be a repeal, with no reenactment within 90 days, of the resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County, Nev., dated August 1, 1939, made in consideration of the passage of this bill, and which forbids gambling and the sale of liquor within the confines of the proposed State park or within a radius of 6 miles of the boundaries thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KENNESAW MOUNTAIN NATIONAL MEMORIAL MILITARY PARK

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4938) to amend the act approved June 26, 1935, entitled "An act to create a national memorial military park at and in the vicinity of Kennesaw Mountain in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out "such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine" and insert "not to exceed the sum of \$55,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING SECTION 2857 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6479) amending section 2857 of the Distilled Spirits Act, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.



The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act amending section 2857 of the Internal Revenue Code."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this amendment?

Mr. BUCK. It merely corrects the title of the bill. When the bill passed the House as it was introduced it referred to the old Distilled Spirits Act. The Distilled Spirits Act has been incorporated in the Internal Revenue Act. This merely clarifies that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

Mr. DEBOUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3409) authorizing the extension of the boundaries of the Hot Springs National Park, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "used" and insert "appropriated a sum."  
Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "\$8,000" down to and including "Park" in line 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an article appearing in Collier's Weekly by ex-Attorney General Homer Cummings about Alcatraz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### THIRD DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate extend for 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7462), the third deficiency bill of 1939, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third and last deficiency bill. The Budget estimates for the items sent to us for consideration amounted to \$215,891,168.40 of direct appropriations and to \$88,271,500 of contractual obligations. The committee reduced the estimates of appropriations from \$215,000,000 plus to \$53,190,056. That is a pretty drastic reduction, but it is a timely reduction.

The record as it stands today, exclusive of the present bill, is that we have appropriated something like \$300,000,000 in excess of Budget estimates. We might as well face the realities of such a situation. When Members of Congress go back to their districts they cannot point to or blame the present chaotic condition of our finances upon a spendthrift executive branch of the Government. Practically all of this very large and unprecedented appropriation above Budget estimates is because of our appropriation of unbudgeted items for agriculture. It is a bad record so far as Congress is concerned. I do not chide anybody; I make no complaint about the action of anybody, but facts are facts, and I say to those who are inclined to brush aside lightly the periodic outbursts of demands for Budget balancing and Budget financing that this record ought to cause them to stop and think.

In framing this deficiency bill we have eliminated from it every item that did not fall within two categories: First, pure deficiency items, that is, items to supply legitimate deficits in the activities of the departments for 1939 or prior fiscal years; or, secondly, items in the nature of emergencies that it appeared should not be made to await the consideration of the particular subcommittees having jurisdiction. In following out this policy we have had to leave out of the bill a great many things that on their faces had merit. Many of them had Budget support; many of them had engaged the very active and enthusiastic interest of our colleagues individually and collectively. It is not an easy thing to have to deny a colleague an item in a bill for which the Budget has presented an estimate. It places us in a difficult position, but we believe that it is orderly procedure, and we believe that it is in the interest of orderly appropriating procedure to require such items to go to the subcommittees that have jurisdiction of them when that course appears reasonable and practicable.

If you will follow the report, I shall now advert to just a few matters in which there appears to be some considerable interest.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, would it interrupt the gentleman to yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact, the increases over the Budget estimates to which the gentleman refers all originated in another body; they did not originate in this body. Is not that true?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is true; but I say to my friend that I cannot take a great deal of consolation from that because those items came back to this body and this body deliberately accepted the judgment, good or bad, of another body.

Mr. COCHRAN. If they had not been added by the other body we could not have accepted them.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We are particeps criminis. We have shown in the last 24 hours that we are able to use our own independent judgment when we have a mind to [applause], and I regret that we did not stand on some of these other things as we have stood on certain things.

One of the items that the committee eliminated from this bill was an item dealing with personnel supervision and management in various Federal agencies. The Budget estimate came to us as a result of the Executive order of the President of June 24, 1938, setting up a Council of Personnel

Administration and various procedures having the very laudable objective of trying to coordinate and organize personnel management in various Government departments.

The committee agreed with the laudable purposes, but regretted the fact that every department had to come and ask for more money and more personnel. We felt it would have been a fine evidence of a sincere purpose to economize through the coordination of personnel activities if these departments could have handled this personnel management problem without coming to the Congress and asking for additional personnel and additional funds.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I ask the gentleman whether the estimates which were eliminated had anything to do with the setting up of these personnel offices in the various departments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what it was, I may say to the gentleman. The estimates were for that purpose.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They will not have the money to set up the personnel offices in the various departments?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They will not have it if they take the position that they have to come to the Congress every time there is some little change made. I may say to the gentleman that an institution like the Post Office Department, with 700,000 people on its pay roll, could not find 25 or 30 people to carry out its personnel management program without coming to the Congress and asking for additional funds. A great institution like the Department of Agriculture, with its millions of dollars that we have appropriated for personnel, had to come and ask for a few thousand dollars for additional jobs and additional personnel to set up personnel management. It was not an impressive picture, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I gather, then, it is the opinion of the committee they can carry on and set up these personnel officers with the funds already available?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We think so and we think also that efficiency in government service that does not mean economy is not efficiency. There is not a governmental agency involved in here, and every Member of the House knows this is true, that could not find places where it could rearrange and coordinate its activities so that it could divert a little of its funds to personnel management, if it were necessary to do so. It is fair to say, however, that in order for them to do that on a permanent basis perhaps it will take legislation permitting them to withdraw personnel and use it for another purpose or to give approval to personnel reassigned. The latter, of course, can be done by the committee. The Committee on Appropriations felt that with the provision of some funds for the Council of Personnel Administration the program could be further studied and to some extent developed, and they can come back to the regular subcommittees at the next session and the proposition then can be worked out. We were sympathetic with the objective sought to be attained.

The only Budget estimate before the committee for civilian pilot training program was \$7,300,000. This was presented before the recently enacted legislation upon the subject, which authorizes an appropriation of \$5,675,000. Instead of \$5,675,000, we recommend \$3,000,000. This being a new program, we thought it could proceed a little slower and that perhaps they could do a better job if they did not have too much money to spend at one time.

About a week before we closed our hearings a Budget estimate came up calling for the appropriation of a million dollars for an extension for 2 additional years of the programs for the construction of public buildings outside of the District of Columbia, which involved the further appropriation, ultimately, of \$49,000,000. There are two reasons why this proposition is not included in the bill.

In the first place, it is not a deficiency, nor may it be said to be urgent. In the second place, it is not authorized by law.

Our committee, it is true, has reported building programs in the past, but always, when it has, its action has met with the specific approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. This item came to us just a few days before we finished our hearings on the bill, about a week or 10 days ago, I should say. The distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is now in a foreign land on an official mission. There was no opportunity to get consideration by the legislative committee. In any event, if the item had been put in this bill, it would be subject to a point of order, and the committee felt the matter should go over to the regular session for the consideration of the proper committee.

The Department of Labor had a Budget estimate submitted for an additional \$2,000,000 for wage and hour personnel. The committee did not allow this. The appropriation for this activity for 1939 was \$1,250,000 and for 1940 we have heretofore provided \$2,546,200—more than double the previous appropriation. We felt that was a sufficient expansion of this activity for 1940 for the present, at least, and that certainly, if it were not sufficient, it would be time enough to consider the matter when we came back in January. Therefore, that item was not included.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman knows, of course, that cutting out this deficiency item is going to cripple the Wage and Hour Administration. Does the gentleman intend to do by indirection what the committee would not dare do by direct action?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, I do not agree with the premise of the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey that it will cripple that Division. Congress has given it twice as much for 1940 as it had for 1939. We are now only 1 month in the new fiscal year and the committee felt that before we revised our appropriation for 1940 for the Wage and Hour Division, this agency should try to see how it can get along on its present appropriation, and, if necessary, come back and ask for a deficiency in January, next year, if it needs it.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the Administrator appeared before the gentleman's committee and said it would be utterly impossible to get along without this additional amount of money?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey that every appropriation which comes before our committee is backed up by the enthusiastic support of the department involved, which always says it is impossible to get along without more funds, and that it is the most important activity of the Government. That, of course, is the prelude to every request for an appropriation.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a very unusual thing to completely cut out an appropriation supported by the Budget and evidence as strong as was offered in this case?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This bill originally called for over \$200,000,000, and we have cut out \$150,000,000 from other parts of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman know, and if he does not, I may say for his benefit and that of the Members of the House, that it will cripple the administration of the Wage and Hour Division?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not agree with the gentlewoman that it will completely cripple that Division. I ask the Members to look at the hearings and they will see that a very large and substantial increase was given to the Wage and Hour Division in the regular bill, which became effective on July 1 of this year.

There is no reason at all why the Wage and Hour Division cannot go ahead with its program, and if we have not provided enough money for 1940 we shall be here in January and they can come as every other department does and bring in a request for additional funds.



Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Is it not true that we gave the Wage and Hour Division \$800,000 in the first deficiency bill in January, and that all of the money now requested is for the appointment of new personnel; 150 inspectors a month they want to put on for the next 12 months. This action will not impair anything they have. They want to control the world.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that there have never been as many offenses committed against any other law as against this law. Because of that it was necessary to employ a great many more people than the Administrator anticipated would be necessary to protect the act and protect those who were living up to the provisions of the act. I believe that is what has changed the whole picture and made it necessary to ask for a larger appropriation. In fact, many persons opposed to the law have been advising that it is not necessary to pay any attention to this law. Later I shall have something to say about that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman referred to House Document No. 419. Is that an authorization?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman I do not recall what House Document No. 419 is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman in interrogating Mr. Andrews on page 274 of the hearings stated:

We have before us several items in House Document No. 419.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; that is the Budget document which contains the Budget submission of this item.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Budget document proposed this additional \$2,000,000 for the enforcement of the Wage and Hour Act?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; there was a Budget estimate for the \$2,000,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman consider putting back in the bill a portion of that amount? Many of the workers have been getting in touch with me about this matter, and they are very much troubled about it. I am wondering if the gentleman would consider putting back in the bill a portion of that item.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that there is no evidence in this record to show that the Wage and Hour Division cannot go ahead with their program on what Congress has already appropriated for 1940. I think they should endeavor to do that, and come back, if necessary, if they find they are crippled. I do not believe we should make an appropriation for 1940 and before it even goes into effect come back and more than double it just on the say-so of the departmental heads. Nobody wishes to kill the wage and hour law by starving its administration—I certainly do not, and I do not believe the committee does—but we do not wish to get emotional about this and just dump money into their laps that they cannot use in an orderly and regular manner. If the gentlewoman will look at the hearings, she will see from the number of new appointments to be made and the number of new employees to be put out into the country—150 a month—that is a terrific undertaking that they are suggesting with this appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If I should bring the gentleman additional information, would the gentleman consider such action?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not advise changing the committee's action, I may say to the gentlewoman.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. On page 10 there is an item of appropriation for the location of a national aeronautical research laboratory. On May 18 I introduced a bill asking an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to have one of these laboratories located in Wichita, Kans. As the gentleman knows, I appeared before the committee on this matter. I should like to know just what disposition has been made of the question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee allowed the funds and the authority for the additional research laboratory, but provided that the National Advisory Committee should have the right to reconsider the question of where it should be located.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is due to the fact that several Members have introduced a bill providing for other locations?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Several other locations were considered besides Sunnyvale. It simply opens up the question so that the National Advisory Committee can consider other locations.

Mr. HOUSTON. Then is it not necessary for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics to come in with an estimate of what it will cost actually to construct such a laboratory?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; we have already made that. That item is covered.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. I should like to ask a question in regard to the item for the Central Statistical Board. It has just been brought to my attention that \$22,900 was the Budget estimate, but no allowance whatever has been made for that. What is the reason?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The reason is that when we passed the reorganization bill we were told that it was for efficiency and economy, and we are going to require these reorganized outfits to live within their appropriations and not come in for more money just because they have been reorganized.

Mr. LEAVY. It is my understanding, however, that due to the taking of the decennial census next year a new responsibility and a new duty has been thrown on this Board.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what they said, but it was not a very impressive hearing, I may say to the gentleman. We felt that we had given them enough money. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Appropriations has held hearings on the matters referred to in the Budget estimates, and they were considered by the committee for the major portion of a month. The committee have brought in to you the items that were presented to them that they believe are required, as the general rule, to go ahead with the activities of the Government.

There are only two or three items that I, as a member of the minority, feel that I cannot go along with. The first one relates to the purchase of 180,000 reindeer at a cost of \$720,000. The promoters of this operation are saying that there should be a purchase of these reindeer by the Government so that the Indians may own all of them. They say that the reindeer are not being properly looked after by the natives and the officials of the Interior Department.

Let me say to you that there has been appropriated by this Congress \$75,000 to provide the help necessary to look after this operation. What they need to do if they want to

protect these reindeer and provide reindeer that can get along and take care of the Eskimos is to fire all the incompetent help and hire employees who are competent to tell the Indians and Eskimos how to herd their reindeer.

There is absolutely no reason why \$75,000 would not be money enough in a single year to teach these people how to exterminate the wolves that they claim are preying upon them.

The second item relates to an item of \$100,000 to start a survey of the Nicaraguan Canal; not a canal to carry ships, but a barge canal of 10- or 12-foot depth. This \$100,000 is for the survey. This set-up has surveyed for a canal of one type or another off and on for 300 years. Such a survey as this to my mind is ridiculous. It will not be built, in my opinion, by the local government and the Government of the United States has no business going in there and building such a canal under any circumstances; and to start this survey on top of 25 or 30 other surveys that I have evidence of, in a magazine that I have at the desk and shall present when I present an amendment asking to strike this item out, seems to me absolutely ridiculous. We should not get into the spending of money for things that are not feasible or where it is not feasible to get the money and that would not be of any value to the United States, but would be a menace, in a small way, to our financial structure.

These are the only two items I care to discuss at this time. These things, I feel, should be eliminated from the bill. I hope when they are reached and discussed the House will vote to do that very thing. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the greatest danger to our democracy today is the unbalanced Budget, the spending of more each succeeding year nationally than we take in. There are three places where we must look for the solution of this problem—in the President of the United States, with his power to recommend through his Budget Director; in the House of Representatives, where appropriations are supposed to originate; and in another body which, at the present time, has equal jurisdiction in expenditures.

We will make no comment about the power and influence of the President on expenditures. That is too well known for any amplification. Our House of Congress, coming directly from the people every 2 years and bearing the responsibility of the initiation, has performed its task reasonably well. The situation for saving might be greatly advanced if another body would relinquish the part it has today, confining its activities to other things which they stress first, anyway—all questions of foreign affairs, the confirmation of important public officials.

I propose a constitutional amendment, which I am introducing today which would permit the other body to increase appropriations only when they would be approved by a subsequent vote of the House. I would hasten to say that this is not an attack on the individual members of another body, and in particular I want to extol the public record for economy of the two Senators from my own State. Both men have been Governors and have served the high office with distinction, and both were known for their economy administrations. Neither, however, are members of the appropriating committee of the other body.

This proposal is directly and distinctly in the interests of national economy. This is the problem this Nation has to attack in the near future. If some of my colleagues cannot go along with me in this proposal which may seem drastic, I plead with them to bear with me that at least some of these difficulties might be corrected. There follow a few of the distinct reasons I have to offer:

First. The other body almost invariably increases the appropriations as they leave the House. I am submitting a table here at this point showing what the supply bills of the

present session were when they passed the House and how all have been increased as they passed another body.

Bill	Total as passed House	Total as passed Senate
Agriculture and farm credit.....	\$816,519,113	\$1,218,666,572
District of Columbia.....	46,915,207	49,524,985
Independent offices.....	1,651,087,340	1,668,218,340
Interior Department.....	159,838,815	174,975,288
Legislative establishment.....	21,641,278	21,985,779
Navy Department.....	773,420,241	773,049,151
Labor Department.....	30,535,770	30,747,780
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments.....	121,399,120	122,624,410
Treasury and Post Office Departments.....	1,700,591,354	1,701,189,114
Military bill, War Department.....	499,857,936	513,188,882
Civil functions, War Department.....	305,188,514	305,267,984
Supplemental military, War Department.....	222,198,047	223,398,047
First deficiency.....	9,979,000	22,682,041
Second deficiency.....	139,871,028	165,662,854
Urgent deficiency.....	2,669,377	3,224,377
Relief, 1940.....	1,735,600,000	1,808,900,000
Grand total.....	8,237,312,110	8,803,305,614

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the detail of the total in each appropriation bill given?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. For each bill; yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is doing a real service and I am pleased that the table is put in the RECORD.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thank the gentleman.

There is a total of over six hundred million between the regular supply bills as they left the one House and then another. A striking example might be found in the rivers and harbors bill, which left the House at \$80,000,000 and left another body at \$425,000,000. No supply bill was ever reduced after it left the House. This is direct proof that they are not economy-minded.

Second. It is the individual Member's request which dominates the situation there. Over a period of 6 years I have been in three different conferences each year on supply bills. Invariably the argument we meet in conference when we are pressing for the lower figure is that Mr. So-and-so will not stand for that. He will fight us on the floor, and words to that effect. It has been the constant rule that they have accepted our figures as a minimum and then added to it what each individual wanted to a large degree. The situation is intolerable if economy is to be effected and the Budget balanced.

Third. In the new proposal we do away with the abuses of the conference. I can think of some distinct violations of the instructions of the lower House by conferees. This would all be done away with by eliminating the conference.

Fourth. Why should not the House, which is charged under the Constitution with originating revenue, the ways and means of raising taxes, why should not they have more power and the final word on the expenditure of funds? It looks consistent that these should go together, and let me reiterate that another body has functions which are not ours, which they like to stress, and which they can stress more by relinquishing some of this power to appropriate money.

Fifth. To make this constitutional amendment effective and to be fair, we should not permit legislation on appropriation bills in any form in either, then we would not be taking from another body any constitutional provisions outside of spending.

Sixth. Items are sometimes never presented for hearings in a House committee, but are purposely delayed and presented to another body, knowing that they will get a better reception over there.

Seventh. This change would facilitate the business of the session and shorten sessions. It would not be necessary to have two sets of hearings and all the attendant expenses, and would in the sum total of everything be in the interest of economy. [Applause.]



Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take you for a moment, if I may, to the Niagara River, an international stream, which, I assume, most of you realize, flows from Lake Erie at Buffalo into Lake Ontario at Fort Niagara. Fort Niagara and the village of Youngstown are at the mouth of that river on the American side. For a number of years a vigorous and constructive program has been under way to remove pollution from that stream by sewage treatment. This followed recommendations by the International Boundary Commission, the State of New York, the county of Erie, of which Buffalo is a part, and the cities of Buffalo and Niagara Falls which have both been cooperating. The cities of Buffalo and Niagara Falls have their own modern sewage-disposal plants, which have been built at great expense; and the two last points at the mouth of the river, the village of Youngstown and Fort Niagara, desire the construction of a joint disposal plant at the present time.

Last year the village of Youngstown entered into a loan-and-grant proposition with the P. W. A. for the construction of its own sewerage system, and when the Army realized this was under way, they very gladly entered into negotiations with the village of Youngstown with a view to the construction of a joint sewage-disposal plant on the military reservation, because the Army well realized that unless it cooperated with the village of Youngstown it would be necessary for the War Department to bear the entire expense of a separate disposal plant on the military reservation. Following conferences between representatives of the War Department and the authorities at Youngstown, an agreement was reached whereby the War Department will build a joint disposal plant on the reservation and, by way of exchange, offer sewage-disposal facilities to the adjoining village of Youngstown. Under the agreement which has been drawn up and is now pending, the War Department will receive \$600 per thousand inhabitants and 60 cents for each additional person over 1,000 as an annual charge for the use and maintenance of the joint disposal plant. In other words, if the War Department does not build this plant under the agreement, it will be obliged to build its own separate plant eventually and would realize no income or share of this expense from the village of Youngstown.

It was my understanding that an item covering this arrangement for the War Department would be in the deficiency bill. I believe it was in the original committee print, and possibly without the committee being fully aware of the situation, it was removed from the bill and is not in the print as it is before us today.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point a message to the Speaker of the House from the President of the United States, enclosing a recommendation from the Budget on this item, a part of which reads as follows:

The act approved June 20, 1939 (Public, No. 136, 76th Cong.), authorizes the Secretary of War to construct a sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., and authorizes an appropriation of \$60,000 therefor. The act further authorizes the Secretary of War to grant to the village of Youngstown, Niagara County, N. Y., for a term of 50 years, an easement for a right-of-way for a sewer line to be constructed in said village on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation from the village to the sewage-treatment plant to be constructed by the Secretary of War, and provides that the Secretary of War shall contract from time to time for the operating and maintenance of the plant by the village upon such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, June 23, 1939.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a draft of a proposed provision affecting the appropriation of the War Department for "Pay of the Army, 1939."

The details of the proposed provision, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the

letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted herewith, with whose comments and observations I concur.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, June 22, 1939.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the War Department, as follows:

#### "FINANCE DEPARTMENT"

"Pay of the Army, 1939: Not to exceed \$60,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1939, is hereby made available until June 30, 1940, for the construction and installation of a sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., as authorized by the act of June 20, 1939 (Public, No. 136, 76th Cong.)."

The act approved June 20, 1939 (Public, No. 136, 76th Cong.), authorizes the Secretary of War to construct a sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., and authorizes an appropriation of \$60,000 therefor. The act further authorizes the Secretary of War to grant to the village of Youngstown, Niagara County, N. Y., for a term of 50 years, an easement for a right-of-way for a sewer line to be constructed by said village on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, from the village to the sewage-treatment plant to be constructed by the Secretary of War, and provides that the Secretary of War shall contract from time to time for the operating and maintenance of the plant by the village upon such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable.

The Legislature of the State of New York has enacted legislation (N. Y. Laws, 1939, ch. 213) as required by section 2 of the act of June 20, 1939.

This project is in furtherance of a general health-improvement program which is being vigorously prosecuted along the entire Niagara frontier for the purpose of ending a serious pollution problem affecting local waterways.

The purpose of the foregoing proposed provision is to make available \$60,000 from the appropriation for "Pay of the Army, 1939," to provide the funds necessary for the construction by the War Department of the sewage-treatment plant in question, and this sum can readily be spared from this appropriation.

The submission of the proposed provision is to give effect to legislation enacted since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1940. I recommend that it be transmitted to Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,  
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, this would not be an appropriation, it would be simply allocating funds already appropriated for the War Department to this use, and as I have pointed out, it seems to me that it would be a matter of economy to adopt this amendment, for with its adoption the War Department will have the benefit of \$600 or more per annum for maintenance.

I quote now from the report of the Secretary of War accompanying the original act of authorization:

The State, county, and city governments in New York State, and the government of Ontario Province, Canada, are cooperating in a general program designed to eliminate the pollution of local waterways along the Niagara frontier. Sanitary sewage disposal plants have already been installed, or are in process of construction, by the principal New York cities in this area. The village of Youngstown, situated adjacent to the post of Fort Niagara, proposes the installation of a disposal plant for the joint use of the village and the post.

The proposal is considered advantageous to the War Department as well as the village of Youngstown. If the village should erect its own individual plant, the outfall would be upstream and only a few hundred yards distant from the Fort Niagara water supply intake. Furthermore, it would be only a question of time before demands would be made on the War Department to construct its own disposal plant to prevent contamination of the waters of Niagara River and Lake Ontario. The erection of a joint plant will preclude the necessity for the maintenance of a separate plant by the War Department.

I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and am hopeful that the committee will see fit to accept the amendment when we reach page 53, line 8. The amendment, which was in the original print, would read as follows:

#### FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Pay of the Army, 1939: Not to exceed \$60,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1939, is hereby made available until June 30, 1940, for the construction and installation of a sewage-treatment

plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., as authorized by the act of June 20, 1939 (Public, No. 136, 76th Cong.).

It was pointed out in the hearings on this matter by Colonel Gregory, of the War Department, in answer to questions asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] that this item would make available money from the appropriation "Pay of the Army" for this purpose and that the money has already been appropriated and is in an unexpended balance. I trust that the members of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], will see fit to accept this amendment at the proper time.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, in most respects the bill which now is before us should receive the support of the House. I believe it is in order for the minority to say a word of commendation to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] who is the chairman of the Deficiency Committee that brought the bill to the House. During the course of the hearings one item developed that I think should receive our attention. I refer to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Those of you who have had an opportunity to read the hearings will agree with me, I believe, when I say that the Commodity Credit Corporation exemplifies better than anything else the fallacies that the New Deal has resorted to to try to convey the impression of prosperity to the country. The purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to peg the prices of cotton, corn, and other commodities. The hearings disclose that at the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation is broke.

In other words, it has exhausted its original capital, and in addition thereto, as of March 31 of this year, is \$119,000,000 in the hole. The loss already sustained probably cannot be recovered, at least not in the immediate future or as long as the administration persists in creating artificial values. While the losses of the past, which now amount to millions, constituting, as they do, a severe drain on the taxpayers, cannot be reclaimed, we can do our part to prevent further capital impairment and curtail the wild and reckless administrative operations of this Credit Corporation. This loose lending can be halted. Throwing good money after bad can be stopped. Fake prosperity can be frustrated. That can be done by pulling up a checkrein and refusing this outfit more money of the taxpayers to play with.

The only purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to give the farmer a sense of pretended prosperity by pegging the price of cotton, corn, and other commodities. I wonder whether we have not come to the place where common sense is in order, where a full disclosure of the facts should be made, where perfect candor and common honesty will indicate to the farmer and to all the people the artificial type of prosperity that has been sold to them. Pegging prices is only a speculator's paradise.

A very large part of the loss that has been sustained has been the cotton loss. The cotton loss is the result of the agricultural program of the New Deal, just as the losses in every other field of private enterprise are the inevitable sequence of unsound philosophies.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes. I feel I should. I have challenged the gentleman, and I feel I should yield.

Mr. PACE. Is it not true that the loss of which the gentleman speaks is at this time purely a paper or book loss, and its amount will be determined by the future price of cotton?

Mr. DITTER. I appreciate that contribution from the gentleman, for I had hoped somebody would say that. My reply to the gentleman is that if it were not for this price-pegging theory on the part of the administration, and if the loss would have been taken as of the 31st of March, instead of this loss being a potential and paper loss, it would have been a very real and a very actual loss.

If we continue in this program, if we continue to try to bring about a pretended prosperity, in due time the losses

are not going to be paper losses. They are not going to be potential losses, but they are going to be very real and actual losses. We cannot continue to pour in from the taxpayers' pockets their money for the purpose of making good the depreciated capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or making good the losses that the Commodity Credit Corporation is bringing about. We should face the facts. It seems to me that we should stop. It seems to me that this is the danger signal. Instead of continuing on this policy that certainly has brought nothing but failure, why not resort to some new tactic that might have at least some measure of hope in it. If the gentleman will suggest that he feels the present prices of hogs and wheat and corn and all these other commodities are satisfactory to the farmer, if he feels that the administration program has brought about a real prosperity for the farmer instead of a pretended and masqueraded prosperity, then I yield further for such observation as the gentleman cares to make. But I warn him now that the administration certainly can boast of nothing but that we are paying a tremendous price for its failures.

Mr. PACE. I do want to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that there has been and continues to be a constant rise in the price of cotton. If we can maintain the present level, I do not believe there will be any paper, potential, or other losses on the loans made on cotton.

Mr. DITTER. Now, will the gentleman amplify that further by suggesting as to where the market is to be for this cotton that is already accumulated and that will continue to accumulate? I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that we cannot hope, unless we peg the price such as the gentleman urges, we cannot hope for real prosperity for the cotton farmer, unless we find some place to dispose of his product.

Mr. PACE. I think the market has already acted down on the surplus, and I think, as the surplus is being gradually disposed of, there will be, as is now indicated, a gradual increase in the market price, and I am very happy to announce to the gentleman that I do not believe it is going to be necessary to make any commodity loans on cotton this year.

Mr. DITTER. May I ask the gentleman whether he thinks there is as much substantiality to that hope which he presently holds out as there was substantiality to a great many of the other hopes and promises that we have been ballyhooed with during the last 6 years, not only in the cottonfield but in all of the other domestic and economic fields? The administration is paying the price today for those false hopes and prolific promises.

Mr. PACE. Well, I would not want to measure—

Mr. DITTER. It is only the gentleman's hope, in other words, and hope does spring eternal in the human breast.

Mr. PACE. There is no foundation for it at the present time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me point out to the gentleman in connection with this cotton discussion, that there is approximately 12,000,000 bales under Government loan; that within 90 days there will be a supply of from 20,000,000 to 24,000,000 bales of cotton in this country, at which time the loss, which is now so apparent and called a paper loss, will be a real loss, because we will sit here in this country with about 15,000,000 bales of cotton that we cannot get rid of.

Mr. DITTER. Now, I look upon my distinguished colleague who has offered this observation as a very learned member of the Committee of Agriculture. I can certainly depend upon the observation he has made, born of long experience, more than I possibly could upon that fond hope that my distinguished colleague on the other side presently entertains.

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PACE, and Mr. KERR rose.



Mr. DITTER. I had no intention of opening a controversial subject here. I simply want to add this additional word. I do hope that we may bring to the country the thought that artificial things, masquerades, pretended prosperity, call them what you will, are foolish investments—that sooner or later we have to get down to bedrock and to real facts. We cannot continue with any hope whatever unless we face the facts as they are, and tell the American taxpayers that they are paying from their pockets for this pretended prosperity for the farmer.

My distinguished friend from Michigan has been very patient. I must yield to him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman if the \$122,000,000 loss shown on cotton as given to us on page 324 of the committee hearings reflects the \$7.50 per bale under the subsidy announced by Secretary Wallace the other day; in other words, if we have, roughly, 12,000,000 bales of cotton on hand and if we are subsidizing exports at the rate of 1½ cents a pound, or \$7.50 a bale, I think it is reasonable to assume that subsidies should be considered as a loss, we will say, on the entire crop.

Mr. DITTER. So my friend would suggest that we should add to the loss already reflected by the balance sheet of the Commodity Credit Corporation such grants and subsidies as have been provided.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Approximately \$9,000,000.

Mr. DITTER. Making, in all, \$200,000,000 instead of \$119,000,000 loss. I think the gentleman's observation is sound. I would not, of course, say that that would be in line with the present administration's theory of accounting and bookkeeping.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I think it would not, because as I understand this March 31 proposal it is based on the price which prevails in this country.

Now, let us take up the thought expressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. It is true there has been somewhat of an upward reaction in the market in recent days, but if cotton is being subsidized for export at \$7.50 a bale I think our present stocks are 12,000,000 bales and the prospective crop is another twelve-million-odd—or we will say 11,000,000—and our consumption is about 6,000,000. Add to the 12,000,000 bales on hand the 11,000,000 that are to be produced, deduct the 6,000,000, and you can figure just what the exports should be; and the question I raise is: Are we to subsidize those total exports at \$7.50 per bale, or 1½ cents a pound?

Mr. DITTER. Unfortunately, the discussion has taken a turn that I had not intended. Cotton is not the only commodity that has caused losses. It was to be expected that the administration would offer help to the cotton planter.

I wish to bring my remarks to a close by reminding those who are interested in cotton, those who are interested in corn, those who are interested in these items should not feel that the losses are confined to their interests. After all, peanuts, pecans, and prunes are also within the range of the Commodity Credit Corporation program. It is the philosophy that is wrong, not the commodity. Price-pegging will not make wealth. We are only fooling the farmer. It is only a shot in the arm. We are only putting off the evil day. The New Deal's farm program has been a flat failure and the sooner every American realizes that fact the better off all of us will be. I am convinced that day is at hand, and that those of us who are interested in the real, rather than the artificial, prosperity of the American farmer will receive their commendation and support.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in this deficiency bill we are now considering we are witnessing an

attempt to cripple the Wage and Hour Act. I think that not very many of us are aware that this deficiency bill has struck out the \$2,000,000 item requested by the President for enforcement of the wage and hour law. I appreciate full well that the majority of those Democrats who are Democrats because of a liberal philosophy are against this sabotage of the Wage and Hour Act. I also thoroughly appreciate that there is a minority Democratic bloc whose philosophy does not include decent wages and living conditions and upon whom, therefore, I can make no impression by this appeal; and so I want to talk to my colleagues on the Republican side, to those Republicans who believe in labor having certain rights, who believe in decent wages, and who believe in decent working conditions, and ask them when the proper time comes to vote to put back the appropriation for the wage and hour enforcement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman intend to offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I shall offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I shall be pleased to support it.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I know the gentleman from California has always supported such liberal and humane legislation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Gladly.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that of the funds appropriated for the 1940 operation of this outfit they have filled only about half the jobs and they have a great margin on which to operate?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. My answer to the gentleman from New York who is in accord with the elimination of this item, is that the President recommended \$2,000,000, and the Director of the Budget approved it. The Administrator of the wage and hour law is so fearful of what further inroads the Appropriations Committee and the combination of Republicans and the minority bloc of Democrats might make, that they have got to withhold some of these funds in order to continue in existence.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wonder if my distinguished colleague from New York realizes that the testimony before his committee indicated that there will be 23,000 cases that will have to be enforced?

Does the gentleman from New York want those cases enforced or does he think those cases can be enforced by the deprivation of this \$2,000,000 from this agency?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Of course, I doubt if he wants the Wage and Hour Act enforced.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman if he wants to answer that.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I do. I want to see that act honestly enforced, but I do not want them running around in private houses, as they intend to do, snooping around and annoying individuals who happen to be doing a little job themselves in their private homes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman can reach way down in the bag for reasons to justify his actions, but the fact remains if you do not give the Wage and Hour Division this \$2,000,000, it cannot enforce this act. Voting for elimination means that you are against the act. It is better to have it repealed than to leave it without funds to enforce it, because a law that cannot be properly enforced is worse than no law at all.

Employers who believe in the objectives of the wage and hour law are going to try to abide by its rules and regulations, but when you cut off the \$2,000,000 and leave that agency without money to enforce its provisions, you are

openly inviting the chiseling type of employer to chisel. It is an open invitation to him to violate the provisions of the Wage and Hour Act without fear of detection or prosecution. This is a hardship on the honest employer.

I ask the Republicans on that side who believe that workmen should have rights and privileges in keeping with the dignity of American citizens and should not be reduced to serfdom, to help us restore the wage and hour appropriation. We believe honest employers should have protection, and I appeal to you Republicans who also believe in that to join with us Democrats in voting for an amendment which will restore the \$2,000,000 appropriation asked for by the President and by the Director of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, the action of the House Appropriations Committee in eliminating from this last deficiency bill the \$2,000,000 item for the enforcement of the wage and hour law is a last, underhanded attempt by the dime-an-hour bloc to scuttle the law.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the Associated Press has given publicity to the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House for a resolution that would carry an appropriation of \$5,000 for the purpose of giving special study to the question of tax-revision legislation between now and the next session of Congress. The question involved is the method by which more taxes may be levied and collected, in order to take care of our mounting deficits.

This session of Congress is about to close. This is probably the last appropriation bill for the present session. I am informed it brings the total appropriations for the year to an all-time high of \$13,800,000,000. Of this amount, more than nine and one-half billion dollars is direct appropriation from the United States Treasury, no part of which will be reimbursed. Of the other \$4,000,000,000, there may be some reimbursement.

The Ways and Means Committee, being one of the most important committees of Congress, is charged with the responsibility of providing the ways and means by which funds are raised to pay the expenses for the running of our Government. The appropriations Committee, on the other hand, consisting of more than 40 members, brings to the floor the bills providing for the expenditure of Government funds, together with their recommendations. Both committees represent the leadership of Congress.

I have just told you that we have already spent or agreed to spend more than nine and one-half billion dollars. During the last fiscal year the entire amount of revenue raised with which to pay expenses is only five and one-half billion dollars. It occurs to me that the Ways and Means Committee could do a most profitable thing if it would go into a conference with the Appropriations Committee and find out what expenditures should, or should not, be made. There is something manifestly wrong with our financial program when we permit our Government to run a deficit of four and one-half billion dollars in 1 year, and provide no means of paying the deficit except through loans on the credit of our Government.

We become weary in listening to the discussion of figures, but the situation presented this afternoon at the closing days of the session is entitled to have the careful consideration and serious attention of the membership. This Congress is charged with the responsibility of raising and providing for the appropriation of the expenditures in the operation of government. Our national debt is more than \$40,000,000,000. I am informed that by January 1, 1940, it will reach the all-time high of \$44,000,000,000. It is time for this Congress to stop, look, and listen. I am not here this afternoon to tell you that all appropriations should not be made, but it is my candid judgment that in view of the situation presented, these committees upon careful consideration, could materially reduce these appropriations. So while this Ways and Means Committee is giving consideration to the question of raising more money and charging it to the taxpayers of this country, it is, in my opinion, far more important that they consider the

question of the reduction of expenses. Congress has become so accustomed to the expenditure of funds that belong to the taxpayers of this country that a few million dollars does not appear to make much difference. For example, in the bill before us, we will spend \$53,000,000 of our people's money that we are going to have to borrow, and we will do it in less than 2 hours.

I said a moment ago that the \$5,000 is to be expended in an effort to find out where additional funds might be procured. After this committee has made a study of the situation, it will come to the same old conclusion that these expenses and these deficits will be paid by the same individuals who have paid them throughout the years. You will not need the \$5,000 to find that out. The farmer, the laborer, the home owner, and, above all, the consumer, will continue to bear the increased burden of taxation. Let me suggest again that the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee between now and the next session of Congress, should give this situation their most careful thought and study, with a view of giving every item of expense the most careful scrutiny, in an effort to cut expenses in every way and respect possible. The average citizen, the laborer, the farmer, and the consumer have just about as much of a load of taxation as they can possibly carry.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, some people have complained because the Wage and Hour Division has been deprived of \$2,000,000. May I say that we have sheets showing the employment of this outfit at the time they appeared before us and the sheets show that approximately 50 percent of the help is employed by that outfit out in the field, and now they claim there are vacancies to the extent of 50 percent of their operations in the field. Does that present a picture where more money ought to be appropriated? They claim 50 percent vacancies in the field at the present time and they want \$2,000,000 to build it up.

Mr. Chairman, we should have at least 10 percent common sense when we face this kind of a proposition. We should not run completely hay wire. We ought to use our brains and not be run off our feet by some general statement of one who comes to the deficiency committee and asks for an additional \$2,000,000 approximately 2 weeks after the bill for his regular activities has been approved and when he never mentioned the idea of wanting this additional \$2,000,000 to the regular committee.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Of course, this whole field is gigantic and involves a gigantic task. I believe the gentleman will agree with that statement.

Mr. TABER. It is a gigantic field, but if it is not operated intelligently and fairly, it will be a menace to the whole country.

Mr. HEALEY. The Administrator has been going along carefully. He gave the gentleman's committee a very careful survey and filled in all the statistics and figures necessary to bolster up his argument for the extra \$2,000,000 that is required. Of course, there are some vacancies now because they have not had an opportunity as yet actually to apply the act and make proper allocations.

Mr. TABER. They have had great opportunity to do it because they have had practically this same amount of funds per month available for 4 or 5 months up to the present time. There is no such thing as their not having had an opportunity to build up if they could possibly have built up so they could get to any such basis as has been suggested. It is just something on which the Congress ought to use its judgment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. One of the reasons for the request for this additional money for agents is the investigation the Wage and Hour Division wants to carry on among



the little newspapers of the country, which were exempted by a law passed by the Congress.

Mr. TABER. That is the case where the Administrator has made a regulation that is entirely in violation of the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He has made a regulation that changes the law.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I hope the gentleman is not complaining because the men who work on the little newspapers will get 25 cents an hour.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Congress specifically exempted the small weekly newspapers having a circulation of less than 3,000.

Mr. HEALEY. Of course, the gentleman wants the men employed on such papers to get at least 25 cents an hour.

Mr. TABER. But those workers do get more than 25 cents an hour. The whole situation with regard to those who are trying to annoy business is that they want to force people out of business by improper, unusual, and undesirable restrictions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I wish to say to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts that the men working for the small weekly newspapers get more than the minimum wage, in the average case, but we do not want Government inspectors snooping around those plants when the law specifically exempts small weekly newspapers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Can the gentleman find a single word in the hearings that indicates that Mr. Andrews or any other member of that Administration intends to do any such snooping? If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that this money is necessary to go after the real violators of this law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe they should do that.

Mr. TABER. They have not gone after the real violators of the law, and that is the trouble.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the failure to include in this deficiency appropriation bill an appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division can only be construed in one way—as an attempt to sabotage the enforcement of this act. This is not a sectional proposal. A great many people say there is only one section of the country where this law needs to be enforced. That is not the case. I am going to cite to you a few instances in several States, and you will realize with me that violations of this law are going on throughout the whole country.

In the State of Georgia we have the case of the Camilla Hosiery Mill, which was cited for criminal violation of this act and falsification of its pay rolls. We have the case of the Tufted Bedspring Co., also in Georgia, which is paying as low as 5 and 6 cents an hour. That is the truth—5 and 6 cents an hour. In my city of Philadelphia we have the Crown Trouser Co., which is paying about \$7 a week for a 44-hour week.

This is not an appropriation for snooping. The actual facts are that the Wage-Hour Division is 50 to 54 weeks behind in the investigation of actual complaints. They do not have the force to do any snooping. There are only three inspectors for 10 Western States. There are only four inspectors for the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. There are only two inspectors for the State of Florida, and two for the State of Alabama. In Brooklyn, N. Y., and in the city of New York there are violations by those who are operating cheese factories and those who are operating ice-cream factories. If you want to sabotage the act, pass this appropriation bill without any appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division. If there is any man in this

House who believes that 25 cents an hour is too much to pay an American citizen, I should like to see him stand up and say what amount he believes is sufficient for an American citizen to live on. If he believes 10 cents an hour or 15 cents an hour is sufficient, let him have sufficient courage to say on the floor of this House that an American citizen is not entitled to more than 10 or 15 cents an hour.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wish to state that I agree with the gentleman. In the State of Pennsylvania there are enough violations of this act to require at least 10 inspectors in that State alone.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Why, in the State of Pennsylvania alone there have been 1,300 complaints, and investigation shows that in 781 of those cases violations are indicated.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care what section of the country is considered, this chiseling is going on everywhere, and those who want to obey the law have pleaded with the Department of Labor to have a just enforcement of this act in order that they may be able to compete with those who are trying by every means in their power to evade the provisions of the wage and hour law.

There has been a great deal of discussion on the pending Barden bill. You do not need to vote upon the Barden bill if you want effectively to kill the wage and hour law; all you need to do is to vote for this deficiency appropriation without any provision for the Wage and Hour Division, because that is what it amounts to, in fact; but if you think that an American citizen is entitled to more than 10 or 15 cents an hour you will have to vote conscientiously for an amendment to include the necessary appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that if Mr. Andrews, instead of being so dictatorial and bothering so much about what this House would do, would spend his time in administering the law as laid down we would not have as much trouble about its enforcement?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. When I hear the views of some of these individuals, I think Mr. Andrews and a great many other people should concern themselves about what a good many people think here, and I think Mr. Andrews should be interested in every amendment that might be suggested to the wage and hour law. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I expect to offer an amendment to this bill, which would provide for an additional authorization of \$50,000,000, and an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to continue the public-buildings program outside the District of Columbia in order that additional post-office buildings may be constructed in eligible districts. I realize that inasmuch as this amendment will be subject to a point of order, it cannot be passed if a point of order is raised.

The next thing I want to mention to the House, Mr. Chairman, is this: The President sent down an estimate of \$119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to be used in carrying on the loan program sponsored by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, did not include this item in this particular bill. The failure of the committee to include this item was, in my judgment, a grave mistake. It was thought that it would be included. Not being on the subcommittee, I did not have an opportunity to learn all the facts in connection with this particular estimate of the Budget for \$119,000,000 for the loan program, but I have been advised within the last few hours that if we do not restore this \$119,000,000 budget estimate for the Commodity

Credit Corporation, the loan program on cotton this fall and the loan program on corn will not be possible.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I cannot yield for the moment.

Whether or not that statement is accurate I do not know, but my information from the Commodity Credit Corporation and indirectly from the Secretary of Agriculture is that we must appropriate about \$119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation if we are to carry out the loan program on farm commodities.

There may be room for debate as to the merits of a loan program on agricultural commodities, but that is not the issue involved at this time. The 1938 Farm Act provided, for example, that if cotton fell below 52 percent of parity, a loan was mandatory, and whether that is a good law or a bad law is relatively immaterial at this point, because this loan has been promised the wheat farmer, the corn farmer, the cotton farmer, and others under the law, and if we are to keep faith and be decent about this thing and forestall a serious condition throughout the agricultural belt, it behooves us to appropriate a sufficient amount of money in this bill to take care of that situation, and I am hopeful before this debate is concluded and the bill is read, we will be able to supply the House with concrete, definite, and specific information regarding the gravity of this situation and the specific amount of money that will absolutely be required to carry on the program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] stated a few moments ago there would be no necessity for additional cotton loans this year on the new crop.

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman that neither the gentleman from Georgia nor any other gentleman can tell whether or not there will be a need for a loan on cotton this fall. All of us hope there will not be a need, but if we appropriate the money and provide the resources to carry on the loan, we will be doing our duty under the law.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I notice from the hearings there is nothing later than March on this and I am a little in the dark as to how much has been used or committed in wheat loans and how much is needed. It seems to me to establish a program and then through a sniping method to destroy the program, is not very good sense.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct. As I understand it, as of March 31, \$157,000,000 would be available for the Commodity Credit Corporation, but since that time we have had a tremendous amount of wheat harvested and much of it has gone into the loan.

Mr. JONES of Texas. In the meantime there has been a wheat harvest and I would like to know if the Committee has the latest data on the amount of additional funds needed because of such additional commitments. I would like to know what the facts are.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's inquiry is timely, and I hope some member of the subcommittee will answer it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the deficiency appropriation bill this morning I was sorely disappointed to find that the deficiency appropriation requested by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act, and approved by the Budget, had been entirely eliminated from this bill. The request was for \$2,000,000 in addition to the amount given to that Agency by the 1940 appropriation bill. I feel sure that Members who have read the hearings on this item will agree that the Administrator has made out a very strong and rea-

sonable showing of the necessity for this additional amount of money.

Perhaps some of the Members are not in full accord with the principles and underlying philosophy of the Wage and Hour Act. However, it became law after a protracted fight in the Congress waged by the proponents of the measure against a determined minority, which employed every possible parliamentary maneuver and procedural stratagem to obstruct and defeat it.

After many months of deliberation and consideration Congress adopted the policy of fixing a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour and a maximum workweek of 44 hours for persons engaged in pursuits that fall within the scope of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution.

A majority of the Members shared the conviction that Congress owed to the masses of the Nation's workers the duty of preserving decent social conditions, establishing and maintaining buying power, protecting the fair employer from the destructive effects of sweatshop competition, and outlawing child labor and sweatshop exploitation of labor. They passed the Wage and Hour Act because they were convinced that it provided the best and soundest method of accomplishing these objectives.

The act is now on the statute books, and we ought to give it a fair chance to prove itself by furnishing its Administrator with the means reasonably necessary for its enforcement. To deny any agency the funds necessary for the attainment of its objectives is the surest way of sabotaging the efficacy of the act whose provisions it was set up to administer. I know that the members of the Committee on Appropriations realize that unless adequate funds are appropriated for the proper enforcement of the act, it would be most unfair to the persons charged with the responsibility of bringing to fulfillment its terms. The Wage and Hour Administration is engaged in a gigantic task, a departure into a new and uncharted field, raising new problems that must be solved without the benefit of past experience. The Administrator has proceeded with caution, care, and discernment in working out a sound system of administration and building up a qualified organization adequate to properly administer the act. Thus far, he has given us every reason for confidence in his policies and has been eminently reasonable in his requests for funds. It is only fair that we should give him the amount he asks since, unless he is allowed sufficient funds to provide a competent and adequate staff, his hands will be tied and he will not have been afforded a just opportunity to properly and effectively ensure to thousands of workers, who are beneficially affected by the terms of the act, the protection it was designed to afford. Nor will he have been granted the facilities necessary to safeguard the decent law-abiding employer from the unethical competition of violators of the act.

I strongly urge the membership to pass the amendment which will be offered to this bill which provides for the appropriation of the additional funds requested by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Act and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are dealing here with a question of law enforcement, and that we ought to deal with facts and figures and leave politics aside. We should also leave aside any biased opinions that any one of "the 10-cents-an-hour" Members may have in respect to the wage and hour law. First of all, the figures of the Old-Age Insurance Bureau of the Social Security Board show that there are 354,000 employers who come under this act. The testimony is uncontradicted to the effect that it requires 300,000 man-days for a complete inspection. That requires 1,200 inspectors for a complete inspection. The testimony is also uncontradicted to the effect that in order to reach a tentative goal of 75-percent performance approximately 900 inspectors are required. If your purpose is not



to sabotage enforcement then I ask the gentleman in charge of this appropriation bill to explain to this House why in the face of these figures has this appropriation been withheld?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on this bill, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to speak out of order. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, shortly our major political parties will be called upon to select their respective candidates for President. The Democratic Party will have served the Nation courageously, effectively, and humanely for a period of 8 years in March of 1941, during one of the most critical eras in our history. We have faced times that have put to test the greatest statesmen this country could bring forward under the progressive leadership of our great humanitarian President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.] Under his able guidance this country has gone forward, step by step, from the brink of a civil war in the early months of 1933 to a point where today we are on the road to a squarer deal for the common man.

In the event circumstances might endanger the security and peace of our Nation, resulting in a call from the people for the continuation of the masterful leadership of President Roosevelt, he could not and would not do less than heed the call.

However, if recovery continues its swing upward and no new economic or other crisis develops, and if no dictum is forthcoming from the people calling for the continued leadership of our great President, then the Democratic Party will be faced with selecting its 1940 candidate for the Presidency.

We are confronted with the task of scanning the horizon in search of a man who possesses the courage, the ability, and the determination to continue the work so forcibly begun and so ably advanced by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Naturally my thoughts center on my home State of Montana, which has produced some of the greatest statesmen in the history of our Nation, notably among them the late, great, never-to-be-forgotten Walsh. Following closely in the footsteps, as a public servant, of that great man comes his lifelong friend, possessing like moral courage, independence, liberal views, and statesmanship, in the person of Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER, a distinguished scholar and a respected leader among men. [Applause.]

This thought has also occurred to many others, and I hold here in my hand a statement by an esteemed colleague, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, marking Senator WHEELER as the "man of the hour."

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Senator JOHNSON's statement. It is very brief.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM COLORADO

In another year President Roosevelt's most successful second term will have reached an end. In my opinion, the President at the proper time will firmly and irrevocably refuse to accept the office again, regardless of whatever pressure may be brought to bear upon him to accept the nomination for a third term.

The Democratic Party cannot win the election in 1940 with President Roosevelt or anyone else if the present serious internal disruption continues. The party is split wide open at the present time and no one can deny it. Jeffersonian Democrats will not support a candidate with liberal tendencies unless he is also soundly realistic and devoted beyond question to American institutions. Liberals in and out of the party will not support a Democrat who would take a single step backward. The candidate who is all things to all men will not please any faction of the party. The people will not take a pussyfoot or a political hybrid. He must be a man with well-established and well-known, deep-seated convictions, and he must have outstanding qualities of leadership.

Fortunately the Democrats have a courageous American to meet this crisis which the party is facing. BURTON K. WHEELER is a real

liberal whose record for liberalism was made long before 1933 and who is so honest and trustworthy that he holds the respect and confidence of the most conservative Democrat in the land. Progressive, learned, experienced—Senator WHEELER has been a loyal supporter of President Roosevelt, except upon a very few occasions, and then it was a difference as to methods rather than objectives. His whole public career has been a tremendous record of public service. He has a keen, alert mind, coupled with a vigorous and determined aggressiveness, which is so necessary in the Presidency. Senator WHEELER, teamed with a Democrat from the Mississippi Valley or the East, running upon a forward-looking platform, can win the election in 1940 because he is the American who can unite the Democratic Party.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Senator WHEELER would not be satisfactory to John L. Lewis, who has a half-million-dollar mortgage on the Democratic Party, would he?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot say anything about that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I merely rise at this time to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to write into this deficiency bill the reindeer appropriation item which this House has cut out on two previous occasions in regular appropriation bills. I assume that somebody connected with this felt perfectly justified in taking this action; but I am not going to have a great deal to say about it at this time. I just merely want to call your attention to the fact that it is in here again for the third time, in spite of the action that the House has taken on two previous occasions. When that point is reached in the bill, of course, an amendment will be offered to strike it, and I hope the House will be prepared to reassert itself on that question. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor again for the purpose of trying to clear up, if I can, some of the smoke and dust that has been stirred up over this appropriation for the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. I think it is regrettable, when the Appropriations Committee undertakes to make an agency observe the ordinary principles of economy and efficiency and exercise care and precision in the conduct of its affairs that we should be accused of trying to sabotage the activity. That is ridiculous. I personally voted for the Fair Labor Standards Act. I have no doubt many other members of the committee voted for it. But just because it affects labor, or just because something affects the farmer or something else is no reason that I know of why they should not be made to conduct their business under the same rules and principles that we would make any other department of the Government do. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HEALEY, says the fact that this item is left out is self-evident that we are trying to repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act. Well, that is ridiculous. Mr. Andrews had \$1,250,000 for his activity in 1939, the fiscal year ended just a month ago. The committee gave him \$3,184,000 for the fiscal year 1940, which began just a month ago, which will enable him greatly to increase his staff. This two million supplementary appropriation comes almost before he gets started on his 1940 program. If anybody wishes to sabotage the Fair Labor Standards Act, certainly the Appropriations Committee, in the regular bill, would not have increased it to \$3,184,000 for 1940.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean that the \$2,000,000 is in addition to the \$3,000,000 already appropriated?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, yes; yes.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Of course, the appropriation last year was just in order to enable them to get started.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, that is a fair statement.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman will admit that that is fair?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. They were just getting started?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is quite a fair statement; but I wish to say to my friend, any activity, no matter how justifiable it may be, can grow only so fast and have a healthy growth. Nothing is worse for a department or agency than to dump a lot of money in its lap which it can just dish out here and there. We found that in W. P. A.—without starting an argument about anything—but just giving that agency so much money.

Now, we wanted the wage and hour outfit to build their organization carefully, thoughtfully, and conservatively.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just let me finish my statement, please.

It is shown in these hearings that there are a great many complaints over the operations of this act.

It is true that a great many industries in the country, which are observing the law, which are paying the wages provided in the Fair Labor Standards Act, are very anxious that Mr. Andrews and his outfit have sufficient funds to enforce the act in order to prevent chiseling on them. We are cognizant of these facts. Our committee is for peace and harmony always. Nothing pleases us better than when we can make our colleagues happy and see them smile, and have peace and harmony. So I have consulted among my brethren, and at the proper time we have agreed with the proponents of this amendment that is to be offered, that we shall, for the committee, accept an amendment putting in half of this Budget estimate of \$2,000,000, but that if another body, which operates at the other end of the Capitol should tamper with that, our friends over here are going to help us to maintain the position of the House on an additional amount of \$1,000,000. It ought to be the attitude of every Member of this House, no matter how interested in an activity he is, to demand that they observe rules of economy and efficiency in their organization, and that is what the Appropriations Committee tried to do.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. Does not the gentleman feel that is the fact; is he not satisfied that this wage-hour administration has been very careful and thoughtful?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think Mr. Andrews has tried to do a good job, I may say, without entering into a controversy about the wage-hour bill. He says he wishes these inspectors to go out to find violators of the law in order to protect those people who are observing the law, and I say that is an impressive argument.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman know there have been many many more violations of the law than we believed there would be at the time the law was written? Is not that the reason this additional money is requested?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There may have been many violations of the law, but our committee feels we have dealt generously with the Wage and Hour Administration.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for his action although I had hoped we could amend the bill to make it two million. I realize we are confronted with a practical situation; and, speaking for myself and I think for the majority of those who are working with the Committee on Labor, I shall be glad to accept the compromise amendment. I had intended to offer an amendment for the amount recommended by the President and the Budget. I am disappointed but shall keep faith with the committee.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made a good economy record. Does the gentleman favor this \$1,000,000 Alaska reindeer park in this appropriation bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that a little later I am going to let the distinguished chairman of my committee tell the gentleman about that item in what I believe will be a very convincing way. Our distinguished chairman is an expert on reindeer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

For expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, fiscal year 1940, \$150,000.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Maryland: Page 3, line 9, after the figures "1940", strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$165,000."

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in session this morning, authorized an investigation in response to a request from the President of the United States contained in a letter dated July 22, from the President to Chairman DEA. The date of this letter accounts for this request being presented this late in the session. The investigation is for the purpose of bringing up to date the petroleum investigation which the committee conducted in 1934 and which the President specifically asked be conducted before January next, if possible, so that pending legislation might be considered by the Congress during the next session. The committee recommended that \$25,000 be provided, but in talking with the gentleman from North Carolina and others this morning I feel that \$15,000 will be sufficient for the time being. This amendment is for the purpose of providing this sum as part of the House contingent fund.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For preparing and editing a new edition of the Code of the District of Columbia, as authorized and directed by law (1 U. S. C., ch. 3), fiscal year 1940, \$32,500.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEOGH: Page 3, line 12, after the word "fiscal", strike out "year" and insert "years", and after "1940" insert "and 1941."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

For payment to Preston L. George, William S. Houston, John G. Nalley, and William H. Wannall, messengers on night duty during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, \$900 each; in all, \$3,600, to be paid from the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress for the fiscal year 1940.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph, Government Printing Office, beginning in line 18 and ending in line 24, of page 3, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I might make a half-minute statement?

Mr. RICH. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this item is subject to a point of order, but it has been carried in the bill for a number of years as extra compensation for these



messengers who work on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at night. To strike this out of the bill just reduces their salary from what they have always received and, as I have stated, it has been carried in the bill for a number of years. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, these men are under civil service. They get 15 percent extra, over their regular compensation. This is divided among three men, while there are seven or eight men doing the work.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But it is something the Congress has paid for years, I may say to the gentleman. It is subject to a point of order, however.

Mr. RICH. It seems if it is proper legislation, we ought to pass the legislation in the right manner and have it brought in here properly, not bring it here under an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] makes a point of order, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] concedes the point of order. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The item "Procurement Division, Public Buildings Branch, Construction of Public Buildings outside the District of Columbia," in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act of 1940, is hereby amended to increase the limits of cost to the amounts indicated after each of the hereinafter-mentioned projects contained in House Document No. 177, Seventy-sixth Congress: Tempe, Ariz., post office, and so forth, \$160,000; Antioch, Calif., post office, \$98,000; Bellflower, Calif., post office, \$125,000; Chicago, Ill. (Jackson Park Postal Station), \$350,000; Ellicott City, Md., post office, and so forth, \$117,000; Hamilton, Mont., post office, and so forth, \$100,000; Hamlet, N. C., post office, and so forth, \$90,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: Page 9, at the end of line 16, add a new paragraph as follows:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

"CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ACT AUGUST 25, 1937

"Construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia: The total amount authorized to be appropriated for the 3-year program for the acquisition of sites and construction of public buildings by the paragraph under the caption 'Emergency construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia,' contained in the 'Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937,' approved August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 772), and increased by the 'Federal Public Buildings Appropriation Act of 1938,' approved June 21, 1938, is hereby further increased from \$130,000,000 to \$180,000,000, and the period of said program is hereby extended to 5 years. All applicable provisions and authority contained in such authorizations shall be operative with respect to the enlarged authorization provided herein except that the Federal Works Administrator shall be substituted for the Secretary of the Treasury where mentioned therein, and that the list from which projects are to be selected by the Postmaster General and the Federal Works Administrator, acting jointly, shall be House Document No. 177, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, dated February 20, 1939: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General may also select for prosecution under this program such projects not included in such document as in their judgment are economically sound and advantageous to the public service. Toward such increased program there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000. The appropriations heretofore made under the authority of such acts, together with the appropriation contained herein, shall be consolidated into a single fund and be available toward the consummation of the entire authorized program (52 Stat. 818; 53 Stat. 672)."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom for a number of years for the Appropriations Committee to bring in an authorization, even though it is legislation, for the purpose of our public-building program outside the District of Columbia. My amendment simply endeavors to follow the same course we have formerly followed in offering an authorization for an additional post-office building program. I am sure that the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which might normally consider this matter, would be perfectly willing for the House to pass my amendment.

This amendment is supported by a Budget estimate sent down by the President. The public-buildings program is sound; it is being well administered. There is a great public demand for it. Nobody will have to apologize for a good post-office building. It is a convenience and source of pride to everybody in a community, and it serves the public for generations.

I hope the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations will not insist upon his point of order. I realize the amendment is subject to a point of order; and if the gentleman feels that he should insist upon it, naturally I withdraw the proffered amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] makes a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] concedes the point of order. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition at this time because of the fact that many Members have asked me in the past few days whether or not I propose to offer a Public Works Administration amendment to this bill. Should such an amendment be offered, of course, it is recognized that this is the proper time and place.

May I say to the Members of the House that I do not propose to offer an amendment to this bill providing for a continuation of the public-works program at this time simply and solely because of the fact that to date we have received no Budget estimate for any amount for public works under its present basis of operations, nor any request from the President to continue the operation of the public-works program under its present basis.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee and charged with the responsibility in some small measure of helping to bring out appropriations to the House, I am going to observe the usual procedure. I shall certainly not ask my colleagues to vote for public works when I myself would not urge that course without a Budget estimate to support it and without a request from the President to carry on such a program at this time. I am a firm believer in a sound, constructive, long-range public-works program, based upon the need for such program, the amount to be limited by the condition and state of the Treasury. Undoubtedly there is much sentiment in the House and throughout the Nation for the continuation of our present public-works program, which has been honestly and efficiently administered without a breath or taint of a scandal in any shape, form, or fashion. Had all Federal agencies and all other Federal bureaus and commissions been administered as efficiently and as faithfully as has the Public Works Administration, we would have had a much better administration of governmental affairs than we have had.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Has the gentleman considered whether or not an amendment to this deficiency appropriation bill having to do with the P. W. A. would be germane and whether it would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I think it would be germane to this section. At the same time, I do not think it has the chance of the proverbial snowball of being considered by the House at this time, in view of the action taken during the past week, and, frankly, I have no criticism of what the House did in that respect.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact there is no authorization for a P. W. A. program at the present time, as I understand it. There is no statute permitting continuation of the P. W. A. beyond this fiscal year.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If I recall correctly, the P. W. A. expires on June 30, 1940, and funds made available

under this act could be used for the continuation of that program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In that case an amendment would be germane.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I think so.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time of the Committee merely to explain the situation and to express the hope that prior to meeting here in January next the President will see fit to recommend to the Congress the continuation of the public-works program. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### UNITED STATES CORONADO EXPOSITION COMMISSION

For all expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the commemoration and observance of the four-hundredth anniversary of the explorations of Francisco Vazquez de Coronado," approved July 17, 1939, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and printing and binding, \$175,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: On page 11, line 21, after the word "elsewhere", insert "without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONSERVATION AND HEALTH

Reindeer industry, Alaska: For the purchase, in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem advisable, of reindeer, abattoirs, cold-storage plants, corrals and other buildings, and communication and other equipment, owned by nonnatives in Alaska, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 900), \$720,000; and for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such purchase and the establishment and development of the reindeer industry for the benefit of the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska, as authorized by said act, including personal services in the District of Columbia (not to exceed \$2,300) and elsewhere, traveling expenses, erection, repair, and maintenance of corrals, fences, and other facilities, \$75,000; in all, fiscal year 1940, \$795,000: *Provided*, That under this appropriation not exceeding an average of \$4 per head shall be paid for reindeer purchased from nonnative owners: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to the purchase of reindeer located on Nunivak Island.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 29, strike out all the paragraph on pages 29 and 30, beginning with line 24, on page 29, and extending through line 16, on page 30.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I referred to earlier in the day in general debate with reference to the reindeer industry in Alaska. This is an amendment to strike out of the bill the item for the purchase of the reindeer herds in Alaska. As I said then, this item has been incorporated in this deficiency bill in the closing hours of the session, and that notwithstanding the fact that on two previous occasions this House has voted out that provision and has said in no unmistakable terms that it did not think that this was the time for the Government to go into the reindeer business in Alaska.

I do not know that anything can be added to that. I know of nothing that has happened that should cause the House to reverse itself. Certainly this House has not shown any inclination in the last few weeks to become more liberal in the expenditure of public funds, as was particularly witnessed here on yesterday.

You recall from the time this item was under consideration before that it provides for the United States Government to set up another bureau within a department to put the Government in the reindeer business; and this is not the time of year for reindeer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is there some concern or some company or someone that owns a lot of reindeer and wants to sell them to the Federal Government?

Mr. COLMER. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that, as has already been brought out here innumerable times, some people went up to Alaska on a venture to raise reindeer in order to sell the reindeer meat in this country. They built a lot of abattoirs and a lot of other things. The venture proved to be unsuccessful and a financial failure.

Now this Government is asked, just as it is asked to do everything else, to take these slaughterhouses off the hands of these persons and buy the reindeer, setting the Government up in the reindeer business.

If this item gets by this time or the next time—and it looks as if it will be with us forever hereafter—you can go down to the Department of the Interior and you will find some high-priced officials sitting down there in fine chairs and in a fine office building administering another bureau, a bureau for the care and propagation of reindeer in Alaska.

I pointed out on three different occasions that it was just as sensible for the Government to go to the South Sea Islands and get turtles, or to the Rocky Mountains and get goats, and to set up a turtle industry or a goat industry, as to go into the reindeer business. Of course, it is fine, it is Utopian; we would like to help, but where are we going to stop? I wish again to call your attention to the fact that this House has voted twice on this proposition and said that it was not ready to put the Government into the reindeer business, that it was not ready to make this initial outlay of \$795,000, which is the very first step in going into this business, one that will last as long as the Government lasts.

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman will yield, it is the last step, not the first step, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. COLMER. No; I do not know that. As a matter of fact, the Department has estimated that it will cost a minimum of \$130,000 a year for personnel to operate this bureau.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, the welfare and almost the life of a good many of the 19,000 Eskimos in Alaska depend upon what happens to the amendment that is now before the Committee for its consideration.

The question has been asked why this matter is presented to you again in view of the action of the House on two former occasions. I can answer that. It is presented to you because this House and the Senate and the President of the United States several years ago joined in passing a bill directing that this very thing be done, and the question now is whether you meant what you were saying then when you said that the nonnative-owned reindeer of Alaska should be purchased by the Government and kept for the Eskimos. That bill was more than a mere authorization, it directed that the purchase be made. If you did not mean it, if that was only a jest, of course, you are going to vote for this amendment and kick the item out of the bill, but if you really thought you were doing right and if you still agree upon that course—and I submit that there has not been a word of testimony submitted here to change your mind—then the only thing you can do is to vote down the amendment and keep the item of appropriation in the bill.

This item, I assume, has been put in the bill partly by reason of a letter of the President to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee which appears on page 716 of the hearings on the bill in which the President said:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 19, 1939.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: On September 1, 1937, there was enacted into law a measure reasonably calculated to insure to the Eskimos



and other natives of Alaska a food supply in perpetuity by eliminating all nonnative ownership of reindeer, by providing for the conservation of the range and the protection of the herds.

Basic to the humanitarian purposes of the act is its authorization of an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to purchase those herds now owned by nonnatives. No appropriation has, however, been made, although the passage of the measure was preceded by prolonged consideration, and although the provisions of the act have been supported by investigations subsequent to its passage made under the immediate direction of the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

I am deeply interested in the efforts of these people in their struggle to preserve for the future the only controllable food supply for which the tundra areas of Alaska are suitable. In the press of other matters, I hope the commitments of the Reindeer Act of 1937 may not be forgotten and that those who are dependent upon reindeer may be enabled by an adequate appropriation to regain full possession of the industry upon which their future depends, to protect their herds from the inroads of predators, to conserve the grazing areas, and otherwise to reap the full benefits of the reindeer industry.

It must be remembered that reindeer were imported to Alaska at the close of the last century to replace in some measure the indigenous food supply of the natives, which had been depleted by the expansion of American commerce and industry, and it seems only logical that we now should take the steps called for by the Reindeer Act.

I trust this matter will receive the earnest consideration of your committee and of the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I want to make here a sort of an argument, as we used to say in school, an argumentum ad hominem. Those who are supporting this measure and are urging its enactment are those who know the most about it, and those who are opposing it, I say with the greatest respect for them, are not nearly so well informed. The President knows something about it and, as you have heard, he has taken time in the press of matters of vast national concern to ask for consideration of this particular subject which is of such vital importance to our Eskimo citizens. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as a result of a study of years, after being in the beginning opposed to it, is now wholeheartedly in favor of the legislation; the Committee on the Territories, with full knowledge of the subject, favors it; and your own special committee appointed by Congress to look into this very matter and report to you has reported that the appropriation should be made, because this is the only way to save the reindeer and thus to save and help the Eskimos.

During this past winter scarcely a week has passed that I have not received a letter or a telegram from Alaska, from someone else interested in the subject, saying that the destruction of the reindeer by the wolves has been simply devastating and that unless steps are taken soon to resume herding—and this can only be done by putting the Reindeer Act into effect—the time is near at hand when there will be few reindeer left in Alaska, and the Eskimos must become the objects of the bounty or the gifts of the Government for their food, like the Indians on reservations, or they must do as they did before the reindeer came. They must run the risk of starving.

One compelling reason this item is in the bill is because it is a matter of supreme emergency involving almost the life and death of some 19,000 citizens of the United States.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. SEGER. I am sympathetic with the gentleman's idea, and the gentleman has made a very good presentation, but I was not here in the beginning of this discussion. How many reindeer are there, and are they roaming wild there now?

Mr. DIMOND. There were about 500,000 reindeer in Alaska altogether, according to the estimate that was made at the time when the special committee made its examination of the subject in 1938.

Mr. SEGER. Who feeds them now?

Mr. DIMOND. They roam over the hills. Nobody feeds them; they roam over the tundra areas. About 180,000 were estimated to be in private ownership; but, unfortunately, the deer owned by private owners occupy most of the best range, and the herds of the natives are thus excluded from that

range. The Eskimos need the range, and they need the additional deer.

Now, there is only one of two alternatives that can be followed: One is to let practically all the reindeer be destroyed, and let the natives as a consequence go on relief or face starvation; and the other is to carry out the Reindeer Act, an act which you passed and which the President has approved. There is no other alternative.

At the present time thousands of the Eskimos have no reindeer whatsoever. They need and can make excellent use of deer. The natives of several of the Aleutian Islands have asked me to aid in securing reindeer for them in order that they may have an assured supply of food. The same is true with a number of native settlements on the Alaska Peninsula. Several years ago I vainly tried to have deer supplied for the natives residing on Popof Island, but without success. Neither deer nor facilities for transporting them were available. Many of the Eskimos have only a few deer, not nearly sufficient to support themselves and their families. The making of the requested appropriation contemplates that reindeer will be supplied to all of the natives who need them and in sufficient numbers to be a real and dependable source of food. Even some of the native Indians of southeastern Alaska have asked to be supplied with reindeer and are confident that the deer will thrive in that part of Alaska.

This appropriation which is now asked is truly a conservation measure. The aim is to conserve and protect, and to make increasingly more useful, a certain supply of food for the natives of Alaska. It would be a tragedy indeed to sit idly or obstinately by and permit the really valuable resource which we have in the reindeer be virtually destroyed through lack of control, through failure to make the modest contribution necessary for its preservation. And the more important purpose is to help to make self-supporting and to keep self-sustaining a good many thousands of these native citizens of Alaska who in kindness and generosity are not surpassed by any people of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made here and reiterated, and every change has been rung upon the subject, that this is an appropriation to bail out somebody who is in private business—in the reindeer industry in Alaska. That is not the fact. It is true that some of the private owners may incidentally benefit from the appropriation, but it will be only an incident, and the vast benefit to be had by keeping in the bill the item now attacked will be enjoyed by the Eskimos of Alaska, who need the reindeer and need the range. If we want to help them, this is the time to do it by voting down the proposed amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Alaska has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] makes mention of the fact that we passed legislation 2 years ago to make this purchase of Alaskan reindeer. No one recollects that better than the Delegate from Alaska, and I think many other Members of Congress can recall; I never saw a piece of legislation that was so lobbied in order to have it put through the Congress as that particular piece of legislation. Something mysterious about the bill. The question of taking care of the people of Alaska, the Eskimo, by making a purchase of these 180,000 reindeer at \$4 apiece has been kept constantly before everyone here by a man who has been lobbying here every day since we have been talking about the Government buying reindeer. He has talked with most everybody in the House, and he will receive benefits if the bill is passed, as Mr. Loman is interested in reindeer, abattoirs, corrals, and so forth. I cannot hate the man for that, but the question is, Do we want to spend \$790,000 now to buy reindeer when there are 500,000 reindeer in Alaska at the present time. More reindeer per capita of Eskimo than there are cattle per capita in the United States. The 300,000 or more of them are public reindeer on the public range owned by the United States of America. The people will not starve if we do not come in and help this organization by buying these 180,000 reindeer at \$4 per head.

Why does the Federal Government want abattoirs and cold-storage plants, and such things? Just putting the Government in all kinds of business. Just because this corporation foundered and has gone bankrupt. I say to the Delegate from Alaska that I have listened to the hearings in the Appropriations Committee for the last 4 years. The Delegate from Alaska came before the committee several years ago, but he did not mention anything about the Government going in there and buying 180,000 reindeer until that bill was passed. There was no mention of it at all until after the bill was passed, and he then came before us time after time, and we gave him the money he said would be necessary to take care of the Eskimo, but he never mentioned the fact that we ought to go in there and spend \$790,000. What a change of heart he has had.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. The gentleman understands that I was appearing before the Committee on Appropriations, and it would have been entirely futile for me to ask for an appropriation before there was an authorization, and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I introduced the reindeer bill myself and talked about it long before it was introduced.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, previous to that time nothing was ever mentioned before by the gentleman before the committee, before he introduced that reindeer bill.

Mr. DIMOND rose.

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield any more, because I have not the time. If I am in error I shall beg the gentleman's pardon, but I am pretty sure that I am correct. I say to the Members of Congress that I am going to insert in the RECORD at this point, if I may, a list of the appropriations for 1940 showing that the regular appropriation bills that have come in have appropriated \$9,607,278,377.28, and that does not include many appropriation bills that have been passed in the last week. We are going to receive an estimate of \$5,669,000,000, as stated by the President, so that we will have appropriated \$4,000,000,000 more than we will have received for 1940, a terrible situation. Instead of getting our gap between income and outgo closer together it is getting farther apart and it does not look as if we will ever have a balanced Budget unless we stop this ruthless spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the tables of appropriations to which I referred, at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### 1940 appropriations

Relief—W. P. A.	\$725,000,000.00
Relief—W. P. A. additional	100,000,000.00
First deficiency	23,765,041.00
Independent offices	1,668,218,340.00
Legislative establishments	21,851,779.00
Treasury and Post Office	1,700,615,054.00
Military Establishments:	
War Department	508,789,824.00
Supplemental War Department	223,398,047.00
Nonmilitary	305,188,514.00
Navy (on floor, estimate)	773,049,151.00
Second deficiency	157,619,059.00
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	1,194,498,633.00
Interior Department	172,679,765.00
District of Columbia	48,002,347.00
Department of Labor (last year, \$132,044,795)	30,536,170.00
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce	122,177,220.00
Relief—1940	1,775,600,000.00
Urgent deficiency	3,099,377.00
Third deficiency	53,190,056.28
Total	9,607,278,377.28
Income, 1938	6,241,661,226.99
Income, 1939 (estimate)	5,520,000,000.00
Income, 1940 (estimate)	5,669,000,000.00

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, of course if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] are in favor of extending the doubtful blessings of a system of paternalism, such as the W. P. A., to the Eskimo in Alaska, then the thing for them to do is to continue their opposition to this item in this appropriation bill. This item to purchase the reindeer now belonging to the white owners and giving them to the Eskimo is an honest attempt upon the part of the Department of the Interior to make the Eskimo self-supporting. It is the result of recommendations and findings of various committees and officials of this Government who have visited Alaska. Their recommendations along this line have been almost unanimous. The last committee which visited Alaska and investigated this matter spent some \$50,000 in reaching their conclusion, and recommended that the reindeer of the white owners be purchased and that all of the reindeer be made the property of the Eskimo in Alaska. In doing this we will furnish the Eskimo of Alaska with means which will enable them to largely provide for their own existence. We will add some 350,000 acres to the grazing territory in the United States, and we will put on its feet the only livestock industry which it is possible to operate in Alaska.

In view of the fact that the findings of the various committees and the recommendations of the various officials who have thoroughly investigated the matter, I hope the facts will be borne in mind this afternoon and that this item for the purchase of the reindeer will be retained in the appropriation bill.

In conclusion I want to say this, that when you think of \$4 a head for reindeer, that \$4 is purchasing a reindeer much more cheaply than you can purchase a medium-grade sheep.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. In that connection the bill says—

That the foregoing limitation shall not apply to the purchase of reindeer located on Nunivak Island.

Does the gentleman know how many reindeer are on that island?

Mr. FADDIS. I do not. Perhaps the gentleman from Alaska could tell the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DIMOND. If the gentleman will yield, I understand there are about 15,000 reindeer on Nunivak Island. They were placed there some years ago and are under the supervision of the Biological Survey.

Mr. TERRY. How much do you expect to pay for the reindeer on that island? There is no limitation on the price.

Mr. DIMOND. I do not know. If the parties cannot agree on the price, the only thing that can be done is to bring an action in court and have the price fixed in court under the power of eminent domain.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Four dollars a head is certainly not excessive, in view of the fact that Canada paid \$65 a head for the same reindeer.

Mr. FADDIS. That is true. Four dollars a head is less than you can purchase a good sheep for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the House by an overwhelming vote took a position in favor of economy and retrenchment in the expenditures of our Federal Government. A great majority of the Members no doubt realize that our Federal Government is heading for bankruptcy. This New Deal spending spree must be curbed. If Uncle Sam continues to spend and spend and borrow and spend much longer, he will soon be bankrupt and the American people will meet inflation face to face. Inflation with its devastating results—suffering, misery, despair, and distress—such as our people have never before witnessed.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes from the bill an appropriation of \$720,000 from our almost bankrupt Federal Treasury. This \$720,000 appropriation is to put Uncle Sam in the reindeer business in Alaska. This proposition was



thoroughly considered by this Congress on two different occasions and rejected by an overwhelming vote.

I intend to practice economy today, as I did yesterday and will do in the future, even though the adoption of this pending amendment might prohibit "Honest Harold" Ickes, the New Deal Secretary of the Interior, from operating reindeer slaughterhouses, cold-storage plants, ranches, and other socialistic Government activities for Uncle Sam in Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, in the past our New Deal brethren talked much about two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage. Should they raid the almost bankrupt Federal Treasury of \$720,000 to set Uncle Sam up in the reindeer business in Alaska, they can go into their campaign next fall with a slogan, "24 reindeer for every Eskimo man, woman, and child in Alaska," under the soviet conception of government in the slaughterhouse business, government in the cold-storage-plant business, government in the ranch business, and so forth. Insofar as putting Uncle Sam in the reindeer business is concerned, this \$720,000 is just the beginning. This year Uncle will raise reindeer and slaughter them. Next year our New Deal "brain trusters" will ask for additional appropriations so that Uncle Sam can go into the reindeer milk, cheese, and butter business and compete with our American dairy interests as well as our American slaughterhouses, cold-storage plants, and ranches.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this amendment is a vote for economy and a vote to keep Uncle Sam out of unfair, subsidized competition in fields of private business endeavor. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. KEEFE. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been allotted, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I was on my feet all during the time the Chairman was allotting that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sorry, but the gentleman's name is not included.

Mr. KEEFE. It is rather unusual that a man of my size could not be seen when I was here all during that time.

The CHAIRMAN. It is quite unusual, but the Chair regrets it is true.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has been recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am not one of the Members of the House who ordinarily recommends or votes for increased appropriations, but this particular item has been made a political football around this House so long that I feel the time has come to properly dispose of it.

It seems to me it is about time we approve this authorization which will take care of 19,000 Eskimos in Alaska and see that they get a livelihood. The Congress passed the authorization bill turning these reindeer over to the Eskimos, and the interested parties have been waiting patiently for Congress to provide the appropriation so that this matter may be cleaned up.

I can readily see, with all of the money that is being spent by the Federal Government, that it is a good opportunity to have a little fund with the reindeer and with Santa Claus, but let us forget about it and let us vote this appropriation and get the matter off our records. After all, it is but a drop in the bucket when you consider the billions and billions of dollars that are being spent for every conceivable project under the sun, some worthy and a great many of them unworthy, at the expense of the American people.

This is a worthy item and should have your serious consideration and I hope that the committee will approve the item and vote down the amendment.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. Does the gentleman know of any other method by which the Eskimos can be made self-supporting in Alaska?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as I have been able to learn, this is the only means of livelihood they have up there in that barren north country.

Mr. MAAS. And this appropriation will be a lot less than what it would cost to support the Eskimos on the public dole, will it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would seem so to me; and, after all, they are American citizens and we in the rest of the United States owe a duty to them to help them provide for their own support. It is the duty of Congress to see that they are taken care of in a proper way. I hope you will vote down the amendment and approve the recommendation made by the Appropriations Committee with reference to this item.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes not to be taken out of the time heretofore allotted. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I desire simply to record this observation in connection with the pending amendment. As a new Member of Congress who had heard nothing about this reindeer proposition, I listened attentively to the arguments that were made when this matter was before the Congress before. I voted against the reindeer appropriation. I propose to vote for this appropriation in this deficiency bill and against this amendment striking it out because in the interim I have had an opportunity to investigate this situation, and I think it would be too bad if we permitted a very worthy project to be laughed out of this Hall of Congress by a lot of ridicule and a lot of misinformation. [Applause.]

Those who know the facts in reference to this situation and those who know the conditions best—and I have taken the time to investigate—are solidly behind this proposal. It seems to me it comes with poor grace to talk about economy at this time, when this proposal simply asks that this Congress do the very thing that the Congress has heretofore committed itself to do, a proposal that will do something for those people in Alaska that they are entitled to. I regret that I voted against it before, but I did so under a misapprehension of the facts. Since that time my investigation and research have disclosed the true facts, and common sense and simple justice demand that the amendment be voted down. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Mexico rise?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to advise the gentleman that his name does not appear on the list of those seeking recognition.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet with the others.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 minutes, not to be taken out of the time already allotted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, some time ago when this particular matter came before the Committee on the Territories I was not very favorably impressed with it. We sat in hearings for many days. I finally became convinced, as a result of testimony and further as a result of an investiga-

tion made by the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from South Dakota. After their investigation was completed this item was brought in, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], insisted that an additional committee be sent to Alaska to investigate further. As a result of that second committee's report, which was unanimous, that this program should be carried out, the item again came up.

We cannot talk about economy where \$700,000 or \$900,000 is concerned, and failure to appropriate that sum means that the Government will take over the keeping of about 19,000 Eskimos, for that is exactly what we are going to have to do if we fail to keep this item in the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The record of the hearings say there are between 13,000 and 15,000 natives. Where does the gentleman get the figure 19,000 when the committee report says 13,000 to 15,000?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The information we have is that there are between 15,000 and 20,000 natives concerned.

Permit me to say that I have a friend in New York who is engaged in the fur business and who advanced \$85,000 to help feed the Eskimos up there and give them supplies. They in return were to pay him back with furs. He has lost every dollar he has given them, because the furs were not there.

Let me submit to you that the Eskimos, even though they are far away from your district and my district, are still a part of the United States of America, and I for one, although I have no greater interest in Alaska than any of you should have, am not going to stand here and vote to take this item out of this bill when it has been recommended by the Budget, the President of the United States, and by every commission that has ever investigated the matter. I say that the gentleman from Mississippi, who is one of my close friends, is misinformed upon this subject. I hope that his amendment is defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken upon this matter on several previous occasions. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the Interior Department, I have had opportunity to become more familiar with it possibly than the average Member of the House. When the legislation was passed in the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress authorizing \$2,000,000 for this purpose of purchasing reindeer, if such sum were necessary, I was very much opposed to it. When the Budget submitted an item to our committee we had extended hearings and we refused to write the item into the bill in the Seventy-fifth Congress. It went to the Senate and there it was written in. In conference, as one of the conferees, I joined with the other House conferees and objected to its being included, because it did not seem to be a proper governmental expenditure, and it was stricken out.

As a result of all this controversy on the subject a committee of three men, selected by the House and Senate conferees, was sent to Alaska to look into this matter. They made a most complete and comprehensive report and if anyone will sit down and read that report with an open mind he will come to the conclusion that this is not only a wise expenditure but is an expenditure that this Government certainly should make on behalf of 15,000 to 20,000 poor, helpless natives in Alaska.

When the white man went in there, the native Eskimo had as his means of livelihood the caribou. It was through the white man's activities and ruthlessness that the Eskimo lost his caribou herds entirely. Then the Government brought reindeer in and at the same time individuals who thought they could make money out of the reindeer industry also went into that business. As a result there have been two sets of reindeer, native and nonnative and Government and non-Government reindeer. Neither have profited. Both

are threatened now with complete extinction and the purchase of the herds at the figure here fixed will be a tremendous loss to the nonnative owners who purchased the reindeer. They will get but a small part of what they originally invested. This purchase of the reindeer will make it possible to consolidate the native-owned reindeer herds with the nonnative herds; then the Government can put the Eskimo, at least in part, back to where he was before we ravaged his land and drove from it his single means of subsistence, the caribou, because the reindeer takes the place of the caribou.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to note that Members have come down into this Well and made the statement that as they have studied the facts, and as they have learned what they are, they have changed their minds. I am satisfied that if every Member of the House looked into the facts they would all support this expenditure as essential and humane. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike opposing a matter in which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is interested and I would not do so if it were not for the fact that I have been into this thing very thoroughly and I thoroughly understand it. I listened for over 2 hours to Mr. Lomen tell his story and I have not been able to see the justice of the claim.

It is true that the Interior Department has not treated Mr. Lomen very fairly, but it is also true that he went over there and established his own business. Here is another part of the picture to which I direct the attention of the Committee. There are approximately, according to the story we have been told, 360,000 reindeer belonging to the natives, or better than 20 for each Eskimo in Alaska. There are supposed to be 180,000 belonging to Lomen and other white owners that it is expected will be taken over. It is said by certain people that the wolves are destroying them and that the natives are not going to have anything to eat. The Interior Department itself on page 550 of the hearings stated:

There have been increases as well as deaths and the increases will more than take care of the animals that have been killed by the wolves.

Now they have more than 20 reindeer for each Eskimo. The trouble is we are spending \$75,000 a year to provide people to look after them through the Interior Department. What we ought to do is to fire that gang and hire competent help to do the job instead of keeping those people on the pay roll and permitting the Eskimos to lose what they already have. If we had 20 milk cows for every person in America or 20 cattle, we would come to the conclusion, I am sure, that we had plenty to take care of our people. They have plenty there to take care of the situation and there is no excuse whatever for Uncle Sam going in there and paying \$720,000 to these white owners to bail them out of an unfortunate investment.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not a fact also that the Department estimates it will cost a minimum of \$130,000 a year to administer this?

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes, to keep these fellows in employment who are not doing their jobs properly now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have come down into this Well to make a speech in the past 2 or 3 years. I should not be here now if this did not involve a question of humanity. It is a question of appealing to our human instincts; it is a question of whether or not we are going to permit the wolves to kill off the reindeer in Alaska and then be compelled either to support the Eskimo on a dole or permit them to starve to death.



I took the pains a few days ago to have the Department telegraph to Alaska and obtain a description of the reindeer situation at the present time. I shall read the telegram, which will give you the picture of the reindeer situation in Alaska right now. This message is addressed to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and comes from Mr. Rood, the chief ranger of Alaska. It reads as follows:

Wolves completely wiped out Noorvik herd. Past spring and winter have reduced Shunknak from 1,700 to 262. Buckland and Koyuk herds scattered by wolves and reduced from 15,000 to 6,000 and from 5,000 to 1,200, respectively, during past year. Wolves destroyed Shaktoolik Unalakleet herds. Selawik herd formerly 12,000 now 1,800, being ravaged by wolves which recently killed over 60 fawns one night. Barrow herd reduced 50 percent by wolves during past year. Natives helpless, too poor pay total herding costs, unless deer herd all will be lost. Starvation and lack of skins for winter clothing face natives who need reindeer more than ever, account low value and increased scarcity of foxes.

The bands of gray wolves are rapidly destroying all the reindeer in Alaska and there is no way of protecting them. The reindeer have no means of protecting themselves. A dozen wolves can kill an entire herd of reindeer and there is now no way to protect them. The question is, What are you going to do about it? I have not the slightest interest in this matter any more than the rest of you. I have a letter from the President urging this appropriation, which I should like to insert at this point.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 19, 1939.

HON. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: On September 1, 1937, there was enacted into law a measure reasonably calculated to insure to the Eskimos and other natives of Alaska a food supply in perpetuity by eliminating all nonnative ownership of reindeer, by providing for the conservation of the range, and the protection of the herds.

Basic to the humanitarian purposes of the act is its authorization of an appropriation of \$2,000,000 to purchase those herds now owned by nonnatives. No appropriation has, however, been made, although the passage of the measure was preceded by prolonged consideration, and although the provisions of the act have been supported by investigations subsequent to its passage made under the immediate direction of the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

I am deeply interested in the efforts of these people in their struggle to preserve for the future the only controllable food supply for which the tundra areas of Alaska are suitable. In the press of other matters, I hope the commitments of the Reindeer Act of 1937 may not be forgotten and that those who are dependent upon reindeer may be enabled by an adequate appropriation to regain full possession of the industry upon which their future depends, to protect their herds from the inroads of predators, to conserve the grazing areas, and otherwise to reap the full benefits of the reindeer industry.

It must be remembered that reindeer were imported to Alaska at the close of the last century to replace in some measure the indigenous food supply of the natives, which had been depleted by the expansion of American commerce and industry, and it seems only logical that we now should take the steps called for by the Reindeer Act.

I trust this matter will receive the earnest consideration of your committee and of the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I have been to Alaska twice and have examined this and other conditions in Alaska for a month each time, and I think I know the situation. I feel confident in saying that there is no one who has ever been to Alaska and who knows anything about conditions there who could oppose this measure. It is a humane proposition with which we are confronted. I very earnestly, on behalf of the Eskimos, ask that you reject the pending amendment. The Eskimos are a simple, kind-hearted people. I know you do not want them to starve. You remember that an Eskimo ran 15 miles to let the world know that the plane in which Will Rogers and Wiley Post were flying had collapsed. Otherwise we might not have known of the accident for a year. The Eskimos are wards of our Government. Let us preserve them from extinction. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 72, noes 97.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAYBURN] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7462, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

#### House Resolution 289

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5435, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor, the bill shall be read, and after the reading of the first section of such bill it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 7349, and all points of order against such substitute are hereby waived. It shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the text of the bill H. R. 7133 as a substitute for the text of the substitute containing the language of the bill H. R. 7349. No amendments shall be in order to the two substitute amendments herein authorized except one amendment proposing to strike out the word "not" in line 20 on page 4 of the text of H. R. 7133. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 5435 the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

#### THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7462) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7462, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Colorado: Consolidated Ute (Ute Mountain), \$38,000, including the purchase of land, the subjugation thereof, and the construction of improvements thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 31, after line 7, insert the following:

"Oregon: Klamath; not to exceed \$4,500 of the amount authorized in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940, for the support of the Klamath agency from tribal funds, shall be available for fees and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys selected by the tribe and employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with existing law."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to establish rental rates for the lease of reserved lands of the United States

situate within the exterior boundaries of Boulder City, Nev., and, without prior advertising, to enter into leases therefor at not less than rates so established and for periods not exceeding 53 years from the date of such leases: *Provided*, That all revenues which may accrue to the United States under the provisions of such leases shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act approved December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, in order that the gentleman from Nevada may make a statement regarding the provision, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for reserving the point of order.

The object of this provision is to permit the construction by private capital of a number of houses in Boulder City, Nev., where a serious housing shortage exists at this time. This provision involves no cost whatever to the Government. On the contrary, the money received from the leases permitted will be revenue to the Government. There is no other practical way of securing passage of legislation at this time which will permit this much-needed housing construction. I sincerely hope the gentleman from New York will not press his point of order. It is in the interest of building employment, and will certainly help in giving opportunity for safe investment of private capital.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that the thing that bothers me about this proposition is that we have tried as far as possible to keep all legislation out of this bill. No hearings have been held by our committee or any other committee on this subject. I would much rather vote for a separate resolution than have such a provision as this in the bill. I feel that I must insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nevada concede the point of order?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the paragraph, and the gentleman from Nevada concedes the point of order. The Chair, therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF MINES

Expenses, mining experiment stations: For an additional amount for maintenance and operation of mining experiment stations, fiscal year 1940, \$15,000.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 35, line 16, insert a new paragraph, as follows:  
"For the coal economists, \$7,000."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. Gladly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I understand, there was a Budget estimate for this item, and I further understand that the Interior Subcommittee, which formerly made an objection to it, has withdrawn its objection.

Mr. WALTER. They have withdrawn their objection because they were not properly informed at the time the matter was under consideration. Since that time they have agreed it should have been included in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigation of domestic sources of mineral supply: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the work of the Bureau of Mines in performing the duties imposed upon it by section 7 of the act of June 7, 1939 (Public, No. 117, 76th Cong.); including the purchase of professional and scientific books; not to exceed \$1,000 for printing and binding; not to exceed \$15,000 for purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work and in transporting employees between their homes and temporary locations where

they may be employed; purchase of goggles, gloves, rubber boots, miners' hats, aprons, and such other articles of personal wearing apparel or equipment as may be required for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; the construction, maintenance, and repair of necessary camp buildings and mining structures and appurtenances thereto; and including not to exceed \$15,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; fiscal year 1940, \$350,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered when the amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$500.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEE: On page 31, after line 13, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"War Minerals Relief Commission: The unexpended balance of the appropriation for payment of awards in accordance with the act approved May 18, 1936 (49 Stat. 1355), contained in the 'Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1937', is continued available for the same purpose until June 30, 1940."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply for the purpose of making available an unexpended balance in an appropriation made for the payment of certain claims awarded and approved by the War Minerals Relief Commission.

By an act approved May 18, 1936, Congress authorized the appropriation of \$1,250,000 for payment to war-mineral claimants for interest losses of such claims as might be approved by the War Minerals Relief Commission.

The First Deficiency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936 appropriated \$500,000 in accordance with and under the authority of the authorization, all of which was expended in the settlement of claims.

The Second Deficiency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1937 appropriated \$650,000 under the same authority, and also an additional \$100,000 for war-minerals relief under the act approved June 30, 1936—these two appropriations making a total of \$750,000 appropriated by the Deficiency Act of 1937 under the authorization theretofore made.

Out of this last appropriation of \$750,000 there is now an unexpended remainder of \$30,342.09, which should be available for application toward the adjustment and payment to claimants of awards already made to them, or which may currently be made by the War Minerals Relief Commission.

These approved awards, however, as well as those currently being made, cannot be paid out of this unexpended balance because of the fact that this balance is due to be covered back into the Treasury, as the original appropriation of which this balance is a part was to remain available only during the fiscal year of 1938—therefore, the necessity of this amendment in order to make this sum of \$30,342.09 available for application to the purpose for which it was originally appropriated.

This unexpended balance has not been used for the payment of these claims for the reason that on June 30, 1938, the War Minerals Relief Commission suspended all activities because funds were not appropriated for the administrative expenses of the Commission for the fiscal year of 1939. I understand that funds have now been provided for 1940 and the Commission is now at work adjusting claims. Making this unexpended balance available for the purpose of payment of these claims, as this amendment will do, will enable claimants to have their claims adjusted at a much earlier date.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee knows nothing whatever about the matter set out in the amendment which the gentleman has offered. There has been no Budget estimate for it, no hearing, no request made to the committee, and it is a matter we are absolutely in the dark about except for the gentleman's statement. I would hate very much to see it go in the bill under these circumstances, and therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.



The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the Department, including the same objects and under the same conditions specified in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1940, \$3,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are three amendments with respect to the wage and hour matter which is now under consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments which I now offer may be reported and considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 38, line 10, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$15,500"; on page 38, line 19, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$227,000"; on page 39, after line 25, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

"Salaries: For an additional amount for all personal services for the Wage and Hour Division in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, fiscal year 1940, \$762,500: *Provided*, That the limitation contained in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act of 1940 on the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to \$1,260,600: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such agency to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this is to add \$1,000,000 to the appropriation for the Fair Labor Standards Act, broken down proportionately as the \$2,000,000 that was sent up by the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation for contingent expenses, contained in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1940, shall be available for the purchase and exchange, at a cost not to exceed \$1,800, of one passenger-carrying automobile for the official use of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 38, line 14, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$1,800."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the press advises us that the motor industry is tied up again with strikes, in which the C. I. O. insists that no one shall work in those plants until he has joined a particular organization. This paragraph calls for \$1,800 for an automobile for the Secretary of Labor to ride around in. Inasmuch as a large portion of her time, a great deal of her time, or the time of her assistants, is taken up by going around where these strikes occur, and is used in an effort to help John L. Lewis and force all workers to join his union and contribute to his treasury so that he can again contribute something to the administration to which the Secretary of Labor belongs, by way of a campaign fund, it does seem that in fairness she ought to ride part of the time in a C. I. O. automobile. In Detroit there are Walter and Victor Reuther, good Communists, if there are such things—Communists, anyway—raising hell up there most of the time with the motor industry, keeping the workingmen away from factories. Why cannot these men from the Labor Department, when they go up there to help the C. I. O., inasmuch as they are aiding the C. I. O. in obtaining contracts with employers, ride in C. I. O. automobiles, instead of having the taxpayers buy Miss Perkins a new one? Further, is there any reason why we should buy an automobile made in a factory—if there be such a factory—where a man cannot

work until he joins John's C. I. O.? If no one can work in the motor industry until he has joined that organization, it would seem as though the rest of us who cannot work in those factories, whose boys or friends cannot work there until they have paid tribute to John—it seems as though we might patronize some industry that does not yield to the demand that it employ only Lewis' men. Let John's men buy the automobiles made in a closed factory, and let John's men eat the products of the packing industry where only his men can work, and let John's men burn the coal they mine, and let the rest of us eat the meat that comes out of the open packing shop, buy the automobile that comes out of the open automobile shop, and burn oil to heat our homes and buildings instead of being forced to buy only the product of those who belong to John's organization. Why is it not a good thing to let the rule work both ways? If only John's men can work in an industry, let them buy the things they make, and let us patronize those industries, those miners, those mills that trade with all of us; that give employment to all who may apply as need for their services arises. Let us have a little of the good-neighbor policy in our domestic affairs.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAWKS. I think you have got something there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think if it were tried out here, Lewis and the C. I. O. might discover that we had something, and I think that some of these manufacturers who are yielding to John's demand that only his boys can work in their plants or mines would discover to their amazement that the tail had been wagging the dog, that Lewis does not represent labor. They should begin to think it over pretty soon, and they should give us some good reason why we should trade with them if they refuse to give employment only to members of one union. If my boy cannot work in a motor factory, why should I buy an automobile made there?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that Lewis bought a mortgage on the Democratic Party for 500,000 pieces of silver, does not the gentleman think he ought to have a little payment back, because he will not have any after the 1940 election?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Lewis does not have a mortgage on the Democratic Party. If it be true that he has a mortgage on any political clique, it must be on the new dealers, and if that is true that is but another reason why Mme. Perkins should ride in John's automobile.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman want to carry his argument to a logical conclusion?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the new dealers do not carry anything to a logical conclusion, so far as that goes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman a question about what he is advocating.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not advocating anything.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Instead of riding to Washington in trains, it might be a good thing if he would walk, because that is done by union men, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; anyone may walk. John has not asked us to pay for that privilege. Most of the workingmen who pay dues to Lewis do walk, but John rides in his big car. I am not advocating anything. I am just stating that I do not believe in a boycott, either of labor or merchandise, but if John want a boycott, if he insists upon a boycott of all who do not choose to do his will and says that my boy cannot work in a factory until he pays him, I ask you why, in all fairness, should I buy an automobile made in that factory, and I am asking the gentleman if in Pennsylvania they are going to give work to anyone other than John's men? If you will not employ us, why should we buy your coal and use your steel?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Oh, the gentleman is always critical. Why does he not advocate something?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; I do. I advocate the worship of the good Lord; I advocate the practice of decency and honesty, the living of an exemplary domestic life, all those things I just mentioned and which JACK GARNER stands for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus: For the contribution of the United States to the Inter-American Radio Office under the Inter-American Radio Communications Convention concluded December 13, 1937, for the following fiscal years.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 46, after line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Restoration, capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1939, by contribution to the Corporation, as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938 (Public, No. 442, 75th Cong.), fiscal year 1940, \$119,599,918.05."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for debate on this amendment? I would hope that 30 minutes would be sufficient.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be confined to 30 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Only five gentlemen have stood up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would offer no objection to 40 minutes, provided no speaker be restricted to less than 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state the following gentlemen have risen, indicating they desired recognition: Mr. PACE, Mr. TABER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. HOBBS, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. JONES of Texas, and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not I, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Will the Chair please put Mr. DITTER's name instead of mine?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have time on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now has eight names listed: Mr. PACE, Mr. DITTER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. HOBBS, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. JONES of Texas, and Mr. GILCHRIST.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me 30 minutes on this amendment, when seven of these gentlemen are on the same side, should be sufficient. I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will allow each of those who desire to speak at least 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very well, Mr. Chairman. I will modify the request, that all time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia, as modified?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment.

It is not merely a matter of keeping faith—not merely a matter of carrying out the solemn obligation the Government entered into with the farmer—but it is a matter of maintaining the already inadequate price of farm products, and through the maintenance of the farm income a continuance of the present upgrade in industry and employment.

The provision is one of the indispensable sections in the agricultural adjustment program. Farm prices have been largely stabilized by loans on dairy products, wheat, cotton, corn, fruits, and other farm staples. To realize the extent to which these loans have operated you have but to estimate the price at which they would be selling today without their support. What would dairy products be selling at today if the millions of dollars used in supporting the dairy market were not available? There are at this time 65,493,729 pounds of butter benefiting from commodity loans. Why deny the dairy industry further benefits from these loans? The price of corn is being maintained at 57 cents per bushel through loans on 257,000,000 bushels of corn. Can you imagine the price of corn if this supply had to be thrown on the open market and the new crop, now estimated at 2,500,000,000 bushels, marketed in the same month instead of being fed into the market in an orderly way as demand warranted? That is what will follow if this amendment is not agreed to and the Commodity Credit Corporation authorized to continue its operations as heretofore.

Even with the support of these loans farm prices have been falling steadily for the past year. Lard is today selling in Chicago at the lowest price in the history of the Chicago market. And as lard goes down cottonseed and butter go down with it. Unsealed corn is now being contracted as low as 32 cents, and the Department of Agriculture reports a carry-over in excess of 400,000,000 bushels, with a new crop prospect unequaled in size and quality. With this record-breaking crop at hand there is no protection or support of any kind except these commodity loans. It is true we have provided for parity payments, but if loans are denied and prices collapse, even the parity payments will not equal present quotations and the entire amount appropriated for parity payments will be practically lost.

But the greatest losses will come through the depreciation of the collateral for loans already in force. At present prices the Government if it desired to liquidate its loan on a crib of corn would lose the difference between the 57 cents per bushel it has loaned and the spot price of 32 cents to 35 cents. But if further loan support is withdrawn, the resulting drop of corn on the market will leave the Government holding collateral worth approximately 15 cents per bushel instead of 32 cents per bushel, a total loss on all loans in comparison with which the appropriation asked in this amendment would be infinitesimal. Every principle of common sense as well as good business requires that these loans be continued and farm prices maintained at present levels at least. With loans simultaneously withdrawn on dairy products, wheat, cotton, peanuts, tobacco, fruit, corn, cotton and cottonseed, turpentine and rosin, wool and mohair, hops, figs, prunes, and so forth, as this bill proposes to do unless amended, there will be such a debacle of farm prices as the country has seldom seen.

But the question before us is no longer a matter of inquiry into the merits or demerits of this particular method of handling the agricultural problem. It is now a matter of carrying out the terms of the contract entered into by the Government with the farmer when he was invited to cooperate in the agricultural adjustment plan and was assured that in return for crop adjustment, soil conservation, acreage reduction, and so forth, on the part of the farmer, the Government would, among other things, supply loans under specified conditions in order to permit orderly marketing and preclude market gluts at harvest. Farmers all over the Nation have accepted the Government's proffer and have complied with their part of the agreement. It now remains for the Government to discharge its part of the obligation and carry out its part of the contract made on its own motion. I quote a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president of



the American Farm Bureau Federation, bearing directly on this phase of the question:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
August 1, 1939.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing to urge that the House Appropriations Committee approve an appropriation of \$119,599,918.05, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, for the purpose of restoring the estimated net impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as determined by the appraisal of its assets and liabilities on March 31, 1939.

Restoration of this capital impairment is of vital importance to millions of farmers cooperating under the Agricultural Adjustment program. Unless this action is taken by Congress before adjournment, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be unable, under the statutory limitations governing its operations, to carry out the loan provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Farmers have cooperated with the Government in adjusting their acreages to reduce the excessive surpluses of farm commodities, so as to bring about a balance of supplies with demand. They have done their part toward bringing about this readjustment. They have acted in good faith, believing that the Government would carry out its part in making available the commodity loans, as specifically provided and promised in the A. A. A. of 1938. In fairness to the farmers who have done their part, the Government should do its part by fulfilling its pledges to the farmers.

Much of the current maladjustment in supplies of basic farm commodities has been due to the inadequate control of supplies during the 2-year period following the invalidation of the original A. A. A. by the United States Supreme Court. The A. A. A. of 1938 has already demonstrated its effectiveness in adjusting downward supplies of our basic crops until the accumulated surpluses can be liquidated and at the same time maintain adequate reserve supplies for emergencies. Obviously, it will require a reasonable length of time to liquidate these accumulated surpluses.

This estimated capital impairment is primarily a bookkeeping loss and not an actual loss to the Corporation. It merely represents the difference between estimated assets and liabilities on March 31, based upon the prevailing prices of these commodities on that date. The continued effective operation of the A. A. A. of 1938, bringing supplies into balance with demand, should result in such ultimate improvement in prices of these commodities as to enable the Corporation to liquidate its holdings with comparatively little actual loss.

We respectfully urge your approval of this item. Failure to act at this time would be calamitous to millions of farmers.

Respectfully yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, President.

The farmers favor continuance of these loans; the farm organizations favor them; the Department of Agriculture favors them; the welfare of American agriculture, American industry, and American labor requires them. In fact, only one argument has been advanced against them, the suggestion that ample funds are already available to continue them until Congress is again in session in January. In support of this theory it is contended that the Corporation still has \$157,000,000 on which to draw in maintenance of its loan program. In order to secure an authoritative statement on this contention and a detailed account of the funds available for the use of the Corporation, I requested a report from the Department of Agriculture, and am just in receipt of the following letter:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,  
Washington, August 2, 1939.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Wallace's office has requested me to furnish you with a current statement as to the amount of uncommitted funds Commodity Credit Corporation would have available for additional loans on agricultural commodities.

Commodity Credit Corporation has available funds uncommitted totaling \$131,000,000. The 1939 wheat loan commitment is included at \$50,000,000, the amount approved for these loans, in arriving at these figures. Present indications are that the 1939 wheat loans will total \$150,000,000 so that it probably will be necessary to increase the commitment to that amount. In addition, the extension program for 1938 and 1938-39 corn loans and the delivery of cotton to England will further reduce the available funds. Estimating these amounts, the funds available would be as follows:

Total funds not committed.....	\$131,000,000
Less:	
Additional wheat commitment.....	\$100,000,000
Funds for corn program.....	20,000,000
Delivery of cotton to England.....	2,000,000
	122,000,000
Balance available.....	9,000,000

If the \$119,000,000 necessary to restore the capital of the Corporation to \$100,000,000 is not appropriated by the Congress, funds will not be available for cotton or corn loans.

Since the average price of cotton on the 10 designated spot markets is now somewhat in excess of the amount which would make a loan on cotton mandatory under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and such cotton prices have tended to strengthen within recent weeks, it is possible that no loans will be required upon the 1939 cotton production.

Commodity Credit Corporation has approximately 250,000,000 bushels of corn, principally of the 1938 production, which is sealed on the farm and pledged as security to loans made at the rate of 57 cents per bushel. A program was recently announced whereby farmers were encouraged to reveal this corn and carry it in its present position for another 12 months, the Corporation making an additional allowance of 7 cents per bushel for storage during such additional period.

In view of the present level and trend in lard and livestock prices, together with a July estimate of the 1939 corn crop at approximately 2,800,000,000 bushels, we have concluded that it is of the utmost importance that the corn now under loan be held off the market, that corn acreage next year be reduced, and that corn prices this fall be protected by loans at the level required by the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

As indicated herein, we will not be in a position to meet the urgent need with respect to corn this fall unless the \$119,000,000 is appropriated to restore the Corporation's capital. Otherwise, it may be necessary to discontinue loans on other commodities, including wheat and wool and mohair produced in 1939. Indications are that the original commitment of \$50,000,000 made for 1939 wheat will be reached at an early date.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. GOODLOE,  
Vice President.

It will be observed that there is actually remaining \$9,000,000 which means no loan program of any kind can be applied to the huge corn crop of 1939, money for which must be ready this fall, or to any other agricultural commodity, and that discontinuance of the loan program is inevitable unless this amendment is adopted. And, of course, that means that a panic in farm prices will follow and 1932 prices from which the farm program and commodity loans extricated agriculture will again bring bankruptcy to the farm and the Nation.

MR. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

MR. FULMER. I would like to state to the gentleman that we had this matter up with the Secretary the other day, and he said that unless they were permitted to continue the loans and make additional corn loans, that corn would go to at least 15 cents a bushel, hogs and lard would go right on down to 3 or 4 cents a pound.

MR. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the information direct from the Secretary of Agriculture. The most dependable estimates we have been able to secure agree that discontinuance of the loan program will mean 3-cent hogs, 7-cent cotton, 20-cent butter, 15-cent corn, 30-cent wheat and all other agricultural products in proportion. Let me ask my friends from the industrial centers—and I know they oppose breaking this contract with the farmer—let me ask them how much manufactured products they can expect to be bought from such incomes and what wages they estimate the farmer can afford to pay for the products of labor on such returns from their own toil.

MR. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

MR. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that there is a Budget estimate for the amount proposed in the gentleman's amendment?

MR. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate for the full amount to the President who transmitted it to the House among the first submitted for inclusion in the bill now under consideration. The estimate is in compliance with the law passed by the Congress after exhaustive study and consideration and is in conformity with the provisions of section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It is endorsed by every farm agency, without exception, and

on its faithful administration depends the prosperity of the farm, the factory, the labor union, and the country as a whole. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing merely with a book entry. Two years ago we passed a law requiring that on the 31st day of March each year an appraisal should be made of the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and if there was any deficiency of assets and liabilities at that time the Congress should appropriate sufficient funds to take care of any deficit and leave the Corporation's capital stock unimpaired. It is no more nor less than a book entry, but will mean, if this amendment is not adopted, there could not be if needed any cotton loans, or any corn loans this year. What would be the effect of that? Follow me just a minute.

By one means and another we have raised the price of cotton to 9.25 cents per pound. That means that we will not need any cotton loans, thank goodness, if you will hold the line for us. Cotton would have to break to practically 8 cents before a loan would be authorized. But listen! If this Congress adjourns, Mr. Chairman, without ample borrowing power in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the trade should think that there is no support under cotton, that it can break to any figure and the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot come to its assistance, what will be the natural effect on the trade? It will try to depress the price and buy cotton as cheap as possible, and this will not only cause the cotton farmers a loss of millions and millions of dollars in the sale of their cotton, but it would require the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans on millions and millions of bales of cotton as soon as the funds can be secured. So here, by a simple book entry—and that is all it is—the producers will be saved millions and the United States Treasury will be saved millions, because it will not be necessary to make any cotton loans this year. I am proud of it. I take no pride in the fact that my people have had to call upon the Government for over \$500,000,000 in loans on their cotton, and I am just as anxious as any Member of the Congress to hold the price of cotton above the loan figure, so these loans will not be necessary. That is why I appeal to you now.

In addition to that, there are about 300,000,000 bushels of corn in the warehouses under loan today. There is a crop in the field of about 2,600,000,000 bushels—one of the greatest crops ever known in the history of the Nation. What is going to happen if they cannot get a loan? It not only means that corn will drop to 15 cents a bushel but it will mean that you will have an enormous hog crop next year to follow an enormous hog crop this year; and instead of lard dropping to 5 cents, as it is today, within a few months you will see lard at 2 and 3 cents per pound. And, of course, cottonseed oil will go down with it.

We are asking you by this amendment, by a simple book entry, to put support under cotton and corn and wheat. We are not asking you to spend one single dime. This appraisal was made on the 31st day of March, and I am sure that cotton has reacted sufficiently since then to wipe out most of the deficit shown by that appraisal, practically wipe it all out. We are simply here asking you, by an entry on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to let the world know that if the farmers of this Nation need it, the Government is ready to step in and hold the market up; and I say to you it is my belief it may mean the difference between 9¼-cent cotton and 7-cent cotton. If the price of cotton shall be forced down to 7 cents, it would mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation, in one way or another, would be forced to advance loans on another 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bales or more.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Always the gentleman speaks of it more or less as a routine book transaction, not calling for the exchange of any money. He would not, of course, undertake to leave the impression that this is not a direct appropriation of \$119,000,000 out of the Treasury, which makes \$400,000,000 and over when added to the \$300,000,000 unbudgeted agricultural items.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman must understand that the act provides that if there is on this appraisal each year any deficit it shall be appropriated immediately so as to keep the capital unimpaired. Then if on the next appraisal, by reason of better prices, it appears that the value of the commodities covered by the loans is in excess of the amount of the loans then the Commodity Credit Corporation shall pay every penny of the excess immediately to the United States Treasury. How would that be done? Merely by the Treasury giving the Corporation credit on its books for the amount of the excess, while the amendment says, in strict language, that it is an appropriation, it is in effect only an authorization for such book transfer by the Treasury to the Corporation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of the Committee will give diligent attention, because there is involved here \$119,000,000. If open confession is good for the soul, let me say that when this matter appeared in the Appropriations Committee this morning I voted against the proposal to reincorporate the \$119,000,000 in the bill. I did so on the representation which was made in the House, in good faith, that the Commodity Credit Corporation had \$157,000,000 available between now and the first of the year to carry on its activities. I learned, however, from Mr. Goodlow, vice president, shortly after lunch, that there was available \$131,000,000. Three and one-half million dollars have been committed for rye last week, \$100,000,000 more will have to be committed for wheat out of a total of \$150,000,000, since wheat applications alone are coming in at the rate of 5,000,000 bushels per day. Two million dollars is committed to sending cotton to England, with the result there will not be \$157,000,000 available but only \$9,000,000. With that \$9,000,000 it is anticipated that if any lending program shall be had for cotton and corn it must be with that very meager amount.

Mr. Chairman, it cannot be done. We had 250,000,000 bushels of corn under loan in the 1938 crop. There is a magnificent crop of corn maturing in the Corn Belt at the present time. Lard is being quoted in the District of Columbia at 7 cents a pound, which is the lowest price since General Grant sat in the White House. Under these circumstances there is only one thing that can be done. We have got to make loans.

These loans must be made in order to keep this corn off the market. If they are not, the whole corn price structure will crash, and the gentleman from Missouri was not speaking by card when he said there will be 20-cent corn. You express that amount against a corn crop of 2,600,000,000 bushels and you will see utter devastation in the Corn Belt of the country. We have to keep this corn under seal. If we do not they will send the hogs into the market. We have the largest crop of pigs in 16 years, according to the Department of Agriculture. You permit those heavy hogs to go into the market as a result of the forced feeding of corn, and the price of lard, in my judgment, will go down to 3 cents a pound. Then there will be ruination and there will be foreclosure.

Mr. Chairman, my record in this matter, I think, is clear. I resisted every cash appropriation, parity, and everything else on the floor of this House. I fought the rule when it came back from the Senate. I fought it because there was no Budget message for it. Neither the President nor the Secretary of Agriculture indicated they wanted this. But if we are going to save the price structure in the Corn Belt we have to restore the \$119,000,000 to this bill. This being the case, I sincerely hope the House will be indulgent and put it back.



I am under no misapprehension about it. We are going to lose plenty of money next year. This \$119,000,000 of impaired capital will be lost. There will be \$19,000,000 of actual loss and \$119,000,000 of a potential loss. Do not kid yourselves about that. It is lost money. But balanced against that, there may be five or six hundred million dollars in losses unless we keep corn under seal, keep it from going to market in the form of fat pork and have the price of ham, bacon, shoulders, lard, and corn for industrial purposes go down to a level with which 1932 will not be comparable. I admonish all of you from the Corn Belt that there is tied up with this \$110,000,000, in my judgment, a portion of our salvation, and much as I hate to tax the Treasury, much as I hate to affront my own committee after having voted against this proposition earlier in the day, yet the representations that have been made since that time and the facts I have been able to obtain from the Commodity Credit Corporation indicate that the situation is different; that of \$157,000,000 only \$9,000,000 is available and we can make scarcely a dollar of corn loans and cotton loans between now and the first of the year, which must be done before we get back here in January.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure to speak more or less unselfishly in behalf of this amendment. Cotton is not asking any loans at the present time, although the market may be broken to the point where we will be entitled to loans under the law. We all hope and pray that cotton will never again need loans. Today we are pleading the cause of corn primarily. Without the rehabilitation of the capital structure of the Commodity Credit Corporation provided in this amendment, corn is doomed.

This great committee has done this thing unwittingly. We must repair the damage before it is too late. Corn is one of the most vital of all of the products in our agricultural program. If we allow corn to come on the market this fall with 2,600,000,000 bushels and no "cushion" of this kind, a price crash is inevitable. Forced feeding of this unsealed corn to hogs will increase the weight of those hogs by at least 20 pounds each. Twenty-five million heads of hogs, 20 pounds to the hog, will mean 500,000,000 pounds of surplus lard on a market already depressed by a surplus. With this tremendous surplus piled on surplus, the price will go not only to 3 cents per pound but to less, and will carry with it every other fat and oil on the American market. So that it will mean disaster not only to the corn people but the rest of us.

In 1936 cottonseed sold for \$60 a ton. That meant over and above the cost of picking and ginning \$34 a ton going into the channels of trade. With 10,000,000 tons, in round figures, this meant \$340,000,000 of free money going into the cash registers in the Cotton Belt. Then multiply that by circulation, augmented by the dammed-up demand, and we had \$3,400,000,000 added to that year's income of American business by reason of a fair price for cottonseed. The next year cottonseed sold for as little as \$10 a ton, less than half the cost of picking and ginning. As a result there was not a cash register ringing in the whole of the Cotton Belt. Our national income shrank by just about that total, \$3,400,000,000. So I maintain that that proves this one comparatively small commodity in our agricultural economy—cottonseed—was solely responsible for our recession in 1937.

And you are going to do it on a tremendously larger scale in this good fall if you allow that corn crop to come on the market instead of sealing it on the farm. When you let corn prices go to 20 cents or less, hog prices inevitably fall, and lard prices approach the minus sign. Lard prices are already on the toboggan, lard selling wholesale today for 5 cents a pound. Yet you damn it and push it farther down in spite of legislative commandment, ordering the corn loan program, and in spite of a budget estimate for this appropriation. In the last analysis it is not expenditure, it is nothing more than the wise loan made on a commodity of absolute necessity, more valuable than gold. You cannot

lose the whole amount, you can lose only the difference between the amount of the loan and the market price. To illustrate, today on the corn market 40 cents is the sale price and 57 cents the loan. But they would intimate, apparently, that the whole 57 cents is lost; when, in reality, were we to liquidate today, we would lose only 17 cents.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. My friend is invoking in support of his argument for this item the fact that there is a Budget estimate. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we have appropriated at this session of Congress nearly \$400,000,000 to agriculture for which there was no Budget estimate, and \$225,000,000 of which was against the specific wishes of the President of the United States.

Mr. HOBBS. The distinguished gentleman may be entirely correct, but that does not alter the correctness of my statement that you have a Budget estimate for this item which the committee has cut out of this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, there never has been a time in the history of the corn loan so far that the Government has lost a dollar. At the present time, unless corn loans are again made and the market supported, the Government will undoubtedly lose some money. In some parts of Iowa there are 50 percent of tenants because of the conditions that have arisen in the last few years whereby farmers have lost their farms and been driven into tenancy. These people cannot hold their corn. When this fall comes they must bring the corn to the local elevators and sell it and get some money upon which to live. Two billion six hundred million bushels of corn is the estimate of production this year. There are already under seal today 258,000,000 bushels. Where is the market going to go this fall when these people bring in their corn? What are these poor devils going to do if the Government makes them no commodity loan? Will they starve or will they dump their corn into the market? Will they be allowed to hold it under a Government loan, or will the speculators get it at ruinous and starvation prices? I have said before that when I call them that word I do it as a term of affection. Where is the market going to go?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Why do they not stop the importation of corn from the Argentine and other countries?

Mr. GILCHRIST. They have nothing to do with that. Corn does not come in from the Argentine when the price is low; corn comes in from the Argentine when the price is high and corn farmers are getting good prices. It does not affect the present market in the least. Corn farmers are not responsible for that importation. It is negligible anyway. It is easy to get up here and say, "Oh, try something else, do this or do that, or do something else." Denouncing a negligible amount of importation—which is now stopped altogether anyway—will not help the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is aware, I suppose, of the fact that the amount of corn imported is less than 1 percent of the amount consumed in the United States? It is imported for special purposes. It can have no possible effect on the price of corn in the United States.

Mr. GILCHRIST. However, that may be, the facts are as I state them. When this corn comes to market disaster will overtake that part of the country and it will overtake the rest of you throughout the whole country. It is an easy thing to predict where corn is going to go. What

price? Fifteen cents. And when it goes to that price, what is going to become of those farmers that have raised corn this year?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I correctly understand that in the gentleman's district farmers are now selling corn at about 27½ cents per bushel?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I showed the gentleman the other day a statement from the local paper showing where corn is. It has risen a little since the time I showed that market to the gentleman. I believe No. 2 White is selling for 30 to 32 cents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell me if it is last year's corn they are now selling?

Mr. GILCHRIST. It must be. It is corn not under seal.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why was that corn, if the gentleman can tell us, not put under seal or into loan at the time?

Mr. GILCHRIST. A great many farmers did not want to go into the program. There was no compulsion about it. A great many of the landlords there did not permit their tenants to put corn under seal. They did not go into the program. The facts are, however, that as sure as the sun is in the heavens, if they do not give the farmers a chance to make loans on corn out there in the corn country there will be disaster. You have not lost anything yet. As the last speaker said, you are not losing. You may lose a penny, you may lose something, but whatever you lose, you will not lose as much as you would if you do not provide for this loan on these commodities.

This appropriation not alone provides for loans on corn, it provides for loans on dairy products, corn, tobacco, wheat, and all that sort of thing. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and as a Member on the floor here, I am proud to say that I have never failed to support every constitutional measure that would help agriculture no matter from what part of the country it came. I have always been pleased to support any measure I could to help the farmer if it were lawful, constitutional, and reasonable. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive of the Committee failing to adopt this amendment in the light of the facts that have been disclosed. The matter has been so thoroughly discussed and the facts brought to light in such a way that I am not going to repeat them.

It seems to me it would be an unthinkable thing to stop just at this point. The farmers were asked to come into a program under a promise that a loan would be made available. To stop in the middle of that program when the farmers have planted their crops in the light of that program and with that understanding and to say that we are going to welsh on that promise and that we are not going to carry it out, is something I do not believe my Government will do. [Applause.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am sorry I do not have the time. I only have 5 minutes.

This would be like sending an army to the front and then saying that because it costs so much to get them ammunition we are not going to give them sufficient ammunition to carry on the battle.

There is more than this from the standpoint of the farmer and the Government's obligations. There is still another angle to this proposition. The Government has tied up in these loans on these various commodities a certain amount of money. It has about 250,000,000 bushels of corn that are under loan. If you take the props from under, violate the agreement with the farmers, and dump the new crop on the market all en masse, it is not only going to cause a tremendous loss to these corn farmers, it is going to cause a tremendous loss to the Government in the money they already have tied up, and from the standpoint of pure, unadulter-

ated, selfish business, from the standpoint of the Government, it would be foolish not to make this money available. I do not know whether it will be necessary. It may not be necessary.

I am not criticizing the committee. I have looked over the hearings and they have been compelled to do a great many things. They have been very busy and they took the facts as disclosed in March when the wheat loan was just starting, or rather before it had started, when there was \$157,000,000 available, but as has been told you, there is only \$9,000,000 available to take care of any possible loans on corn, cotton, and other commodities. Happily, it does not seem there will be any necessity for a cotton loan this year if the conditions keep up and no one rocks the boat; but if the boat is rocked, there is no telling what will be necessary. However, it is hoped that a loan will not be necessary on cotton. Apparently, there will be on corn, and that is just as much a part of the program as cotton or any other commodity. There is only \$9,000,000 left uncommitted or not potentially committed in connection with this proposition, according to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us do the sensible thing. Let us not build a battleship and not put guns on it. Let us not do a job halfway and then not finish that job.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from Virginia referred to the amount appropriated which the Budget Director had not agreed upon. Is it not true that if you fail to appropriate this money, because of destructive prices that money which has already been appropriated will be almost a total loss because of such prices?

Mr. JONES of Texas. There is very grave danger the loss will be much more. If the trade knows and everyone else begins to realize that there is no way to cushion the market or that there is no way to prevent this loss, then the buyer will stay out and say, "It is all going to be dumped on the market, we will not buy now, we will wait until it goes to the bottom," and you may be burning corn like you did in 1932. I do not believe you are going to do that.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BOLLES. I would like to know about this \$119,000,000 which, as the gentleman has said, is for the dairy, and one other speaker said that it is for the dairy. I would like to know just what is in this for the dairy people.

Mr. JONES of Texas. On this particular proposition, there is \$119,000,000 available for every farm commodity in America, if it is needed. There is not any limit whatever, I will say to the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, what has been said by our dear friends from the Southern Cotton States, and from the Northern Corn States, is a perfectly natural statement to have made under the present circumstances, and in view of the fact that this is public business which we are now discussing, and that it involves the funds of the Treasury, of the taxpayers of this country, the few observations which I shall make I think are also perfectly normal.

To save my life I cannot comprehend what ever led the Congress of the United States into such a program in the first place, and, in the second place, why it continues the procedure. Let us look at some of the statements which have been made here for a moment. It is my understanding, and if this is not correct, I hope someone from the Corn States, or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will correct me, that loans will not be made available for the coming crop of corn until perhaps October or November. If that is true, what is the farmer going to feed to the hogs in the meantime, and I am referring now to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. What is the farmer going to feed to the hogs in the meantime except new corn, because considerable old corn crop is under seal.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Not all of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They say not all of it is under seal. What percentage is not under seal?



Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Out of 400,000,000 bushels of carry-over old corn there are only 157,000,000 bushels under seal.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Only 157,000,000 bushels under seal. Can those farmers who did not comply in the previous crop year and who put the corn in the bins, not in the loan, get a loan now or at a later date on the old corn?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wish to correct my figures. It should be 258,000,000 bushels.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation makes loans only on the current crop for which the loans are made.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then we have the difference between those two figures. The corn in the crib at the present time which cannot be put under loan is going to move to the stomachs of the hog crop now in the feeding pens. If that is not correct I hope someone will take the time to answer that, but if it is correct, it sets off the argument presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Why, the farmers feed green corn and snap corn out of the present crop, and it is never intended that corn should go into a loan or a crib at all, and no one can estimate how much that will be. They can carry their pigs over until they get this crop ready for husking.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That brings us to the point I want to develop, because you can now see that we are not going to get into the facts in this case on account of the limited time. What I would like to do is see this situation analyzed for the specific purpose of getting fixed in our own mind at this point some of the developments that we are up against. Here is a situation where we say to the world that we are going to make loans on these commodities in excess of their market price. That is, we will take these commodities, put them on the shelf, and keep them out of the channels of consumption, and thereby build greater stocks to be financed in the future and bear down on the market prices, whatever they may be. Let me take this thought, for instance. Suppose the coming crop does not go into the loan—and I am now referring to cotton. Suppose it does not go into the loan by reason of the lack of funds? The farmer sells his cotton. The Government does not have to sell its cotton. The Government is strongly financed. The cotton owned by the Government is in strong hands. The Government is not a distressed seller. Therefore, if the Government does not liquidate its inventories on the low price, the Government suffers no actual dollar loss until that stock is liquidated through sale. So the argument which has been made in that respect you may as well set aside.

Let us take another point. You can apply the same situation with reference to corn. Even if you put these stocks of cotton or corn or whatever it may be on the shelf, let me inform you that the purchasing agents of this country are wise, and they are well informed with reference to reserve stocks. They keep their eyes on reserve stocks, and it is the reserve stocks which influence the psychology of the man who does the buying. He knows that some day a Congress, a fickle-minded Congress, or a conservative-minded Congress, is going to reverse the policy, and that these inventories are going to be put into the channels of trade. Therefore he buys from hand to mouth, afraid to acquire ownership. Therefore you keep your markets disturbed constantly. You keep people unfriendly to the commodity. You keep them afraid to buy. You keep them afraid to carry inventories, because you have such great stocks concentrated in the hands of one holder—the Government—and that means in the hands of politics, and that is dangerous to the primary growers or producers now and all the rest of the time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, while millions of people go hungry and half ragged, why do we place goods out of their reach? Why do we not proceed on a basis that will get produced foodstuffs and goods into consumption? That is what they are produced for. Why do we go about, using every device that can be conceived to place goods out of the reach of those who would buy? We all know that is unsound. We all know these accumulated stocks as they pile up from

season to season will further demoralize the markets. We all know that as the commodities are concentrated into the hands of government that the political temptation becomes stronger until there comes a collapse that ruins all who hold the goods. I pray that you will let the ownership be held by many people for that will add strength to the market, give confidence to the holders, and help all involved.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is not to be criticized for its actions. They have been authorized by the Congress. But the Congress is subject to criticism for some of its actions. For instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation could save probably as much as \$10,000,000 annually on the storage of cotton alone if Congress would permit it to negotiate for better storage rates. But what do we do? Look up the record and see how Congress has protected the warehousemen, instead of the taxpayers. We could at least correct this bad situation, and thereby give the Corporation another \$10,000,000 with which to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is the third deficiency bill. All during the session the Appropriations Committee has struggled with the problems of appropriations. The Subcommittee on Agriculture has been working very strenuously on the important things in connection with agriculture. They did not report their bill until April 1 of this year. We then had the first deficiency bill. We had a second deficiency bill. We had an emergency deficiency bill, and here is the third deficiency bill; and until this day we have heard nothing in the way of dire prophecies as to what is going to happen if the Commodity Credit Corporation did not get this money.

It is always true that the proponents of an increased appropriation make conditions look just as terrible as possible, but is it not just a little strange that this thing about which they speak now suddenly appears so disastrous, and is the big issue in agriculture? It has become the outstanding feature, because the other appropriations have passed. Is it not remarkable that this has not been mentioned to us in the agricultural bill or in any of the emergency appropriations or deficiency appropriations bills this year? Why, gentlemen, you know that if this need could be as these gentlemen try to picture it today, we would have had all kinds of appeals made to us, and other bills would have included other huge sums.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I decline to yield until I finish my statement. Not only did these gentlemen not raise their voice before the committee, not only did they not come before us and ask for this before, but also the heads of the Department of Agriculture, who have some knowledge of what was going to happen to the farmer if this thing were not done, did not heretofore seek funds for this purpose. We did not have until this third deficiency a statement made about this proposition by the Department. Finally when they did appear before our committee and testified, there was not one word of dire prophecy as to what would happen to the farmer if they did not get it. We tried to get them to say just what would happen if the money were not put into this fund. The witnesses hesitated to make any statement. They showed no concern. They showed no fear. They showed no great interest in it. The result was that the committee could not get one word as to why this matter should not be deferred and taken up by the regular committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I decline to yield at present.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, you will recall that we have had other agricultural appropriations here. I was led to believe that agriculture was to be assassinated by each of these other appropriations if they did not get them, according to the statements of the same gentlemen who have spoken today. I well recall the arguments on the parity payments and the arguments on the Farm Tenancy Act. Every one of them was the same type of speech and reflected the kind of argument exemplified by the famous speech that "grass would grow in the streets of Chicago." The fact re-

mains that we have appropriated this year \$1,206,000,000 plus for agriculture. I wish we had time to discuss this whole commodity-credit program. There are many things about it that this Committee should know. It is not a loan. It is almost a gift—I mean, a loan at a price higher than they could get on the market and without recourse.

The testimony before our committee was that in most cases if they would buy it outright the Government would be better off than under this loan feature.

Now, the figures that have been given are not correct. According to my information, just received from the Department, there is a balance available for loans today of \$131,000,000. It is true that there are commitments, but they run into the future. One hundred million dollars has been committed for wheat and \$20,000,000 for corn. That leaves a balance of \$9,000,000. What the committee says is that it is a matter that should be handled by a committee giving it study and going into it properly, and it can be done right after the first of the year. The committee believes that nobody will be hurt if we let the regular committee handle it in the regular way, and these frightening prophecies, I think, are a little exaggerated.

We hope you will support the committee. [Applause.]  
[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 95, noes 94.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 110, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strategic and critical materials: For all necessary expenses for the acquisition, transportation, maintenance, storage, and rotation of strategic and critical materials in accordance with sections 1 to 6, inclusive, of the act of June 7, 1939 (Public, No. 117, 76th Cong.), including personal services and rental and maintenance of storage space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$25 per diem for any person so employed; printing and binding; and traveling expenses; fiscal year 1940, to continue available until expended, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That when, in order to prevent deterioration, materials purchased with funds from this appropriation are issued to other departments and agencies of the Government, or sold, reimbursement therefor or the proceeds of such sale shall be credited to this appropriation.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: On page 50, line 23, after the comma, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, this item is in this appropriation bill because of an authorization bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and passed by the House about 3 months ago. The authorization bill provided for \$100,000,000 to be appropriated during the 4 years 1939 to 1943, inclusive, for the purchase of strategic materials. The reason this was not itemized year by year was because the officers of the Procurement Department of the Army and the Navy requested that the entire amount be made available during the 4 years because they thought situations might arise where it would be necessary to spend more than \$25,000,000 in any one year.

It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations has fallen for the same line of propaganda and the same lobbying activities of the American Manganese Producers' Association which has been evidenced in the past 5 years while this matter has been before the Congress. On the strength of the argument that domestic supply can be developed to take care of these materials they have cut this appropriation from \$25,000,000 to \$10,000,000. I particularly direct the

attention of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] to the fact that this appropriation has been cut down to \$10,000,000.

Among the strategic materials are four of first priority: Tin, manganese, chromium, and tungsten. At the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs upon this legislation, which were very exhaustive and reached into 4 weeks, no one appeared who claimed that by any stretch of the imagination could the United States produce enough tungsten, tin, or chromium to become self-sufficient in these materials. The American Manganese Producers' Association appeared there and made claims as to how much manganese they could produce, but in analyzing their claims we find that under their most optimistic statements they would not in 8 years' time be able to make us self-sufficient on manganese.

I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman from Virginia, and also the attention of the members of the committee here this afternoon, to the fact that this item of \$10,000,000 would purchase only one-seventh of the tin we annually consume. We consume about \$70,000,000 worth of tin. We use about \$22,000,000 worth of manganese. It would not, therefore, purchase half the manganese we consume in a year, to say nothing whatever about tungsten, chromium, and a great many other of these essential commodities which we do not produce.

All of the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs regarding these items by members of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, by the Bureau of Mines, by the State Department, or by anyone else who has been paying attention to this matter since the World War was to the effect that we could not possibly hope to be self-sufficient through our domestic production. Throughout the whole matter every effort was made by the domestic producers to prostitute this legislation to their own ends, although they have proven by their own efforts time and time again that they are unable to produce manganese enough to begin to satisfy our domestic requirements. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations went into this matter very carefully, as will be disclosed in the hearings, and provided \$10,000,000 for the purchase of these critical minerals and materials for the next fiscal year.

It was brought to our attention by the Bureau of Mines that there were possibilities of domestic development of manganese and other materials. Manganese is the No. 1 item in importance. The committee felt from statements made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the distinguished gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], himself a mining engineer, that there were possibilities of domestic development, and that if a smaller amount were used for purchase in the immediate future it would be a greater encouragement for domestic development.

We feel that we have provided enough money for the purchase of these materials for the coming year in order to give domestic producers a chance to supply the demand.

I hope the Committee will leave the item just as the committee reported it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon, on page 35, line 16, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] offered an amendment inserting \$7,000 in the bill which had been covered by a Budget estimate for an economic investigation into the coal industry for coal statistics. The gentleman's amendment was worded "For coal economists, \$7,000." The Clerk has secured the correct language from the Budget estimate, and I ask



unanimous consent that the proceedings had earlier, whereby the amendment was agreed to, be vacated and the consideration of an amendment which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: In lieu of the amendment of Mr. WALTER, page 35, after line 16, insert a new paragraph as follows: "Economics of mineral industries: For an additional amount for inquiries and investigations, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, for the fiscal year 1940, \$7,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the House passed an authorization providing \$40,000 for the United States Sesquicentennial Commission, winding up its proceedings. This authorization was for the purpose of printing the proceedings and the material which this Commission had collected for the purposes for which it was organized. The matter was not included in this bill because the authorization had not passed. The sum involved is \$40,000, which winds up the so-called Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 11, after line 23, to insert this item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 11, after line 23, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For compiling and publishing a history of the formation, the signing, the ratification, and the establishment of the Constitution, including such historical facts and data as the Commission may deem pertinent relative to the commencement of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution; the proceedings and ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States under the Constitution; the adoption and ratification of the Bill of Rights, and the first meeting of the Supreme Court of the United States; including therein also a final report of the activities of the Commission during the Nation-wide observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation, ratification, and establishment of the Constitution, fiscal year 1940, \$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military posts: For an additional amount for construction and installation of buildings, flying fields, and appurtenances thereto, including the same objects specified under this head in the Supplemental Military Appropriation Act, 1940, \$8,431,300, to remain available until expended, and, in addition, the Quartermaster General, when authorized by the Secretary of War, may enter into contracts prior to July 1, 1940, for the same purposes, to an amount not in excess of \$8,500,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Page 51, line 15, after the word "until", strike out the word "expended" and insert "June 30, 1941."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make these funds available until the end of the fiscal year 1941, instead of making the funds available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUNKEL: Page 51, line 21, insert: "Military posts: For the construction, rehabilitation, and installation at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., of a medical field-service school and such utilities, equipment, and appurtenances thereto as may be

necessary, including all general administrative expenses in connection therewith, without reference to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 1339; 40 U. S. C., 267), fiscal year 1940, \$375,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government has a field-service school for the medical department at Carlisle, Pa. Recently one of the buildings at that school was condemned as unsafe. Since that time the Army post there has not been able to use the building. Recently an authorization bill was passed providing \$375,000 to be used for this purpose, which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

As I understand it, the Appropriations Committee is not so much opposed to the appropriation as they are to the idea of including it in this deficiency appropriation bill. If the money is not provided at the present time, it will seriously handicap the Army station at Carlisle, because it will not have the use of its gymnasium next winter. The money eventually will be appropriated by this Congress, I am sure. If the amount is not carried in this bill, the post will be deprived of this building for a period of 7 months. The post will eventually get the building, and the construction will be made.

It seems to me the part of wisdom and economy to appropriate the money now, get the building started and therefore put the post in the position of being able to use the building next winter, at which time the gymnasium and the other facilities in the building will be very essential to the upkeep of the post. I dislike taking issue with the Committee on Appropriations, but it seems to me this should go into the pending bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. As I understand it, the gymnasium is now being used for medical purposes and cannot be used next winter?

Mr. KUNKEL. None of the building can be used because it has been condemned as unsafe. As I said before, this item has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The War Department is very strongly in favor of it and has helped get approval by the Bureau of the Budget. I hope the Committee will see fit to put this item in the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This building which the gentleman wants to replace is the remains of the old Indian school at Carlisle?

Mr. KUNKEL. The present Army post there is on the site of the old Indian school, which was very famous in the past for its football attainments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just one word and then I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

This item came up for consideration before the committee but after a thorough consideration of it it appeared to be an item that certainly should go to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with the War Department. It was not an emergency item or a deficiency item, but an item that the subcommittee handling the War Department appropriation bill should study. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was chairman of that committee, is a member of the Deficiency Committee and felt that way about it. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make such statement as he feels he should make.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago Senator GUFFEY put this same item in our War Department appropriation bill over in the Senate and in conference I had it cut out.

Two years have elapsed since then, during which time they could have brought this matter to the attention of my committee if they had elected so to do.

A second reason for my opposition to the amendment is that in fairness to all Army posts I believe we should not choose to allow this item. There are many Army posts which are up against it just the same as is this post. For us to select one Army post before the others is not fair. This post is in my State and I should like to see the item allowed, but as chairman of your subcommittee I do not choose to favor my State in preference to any other State or this Army post in preference to any other Army post. Therefore, I ask the Committee to vote down this amendment.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. Two years ago this building had not been condemned as unsafe.

Mr. SNYDER. That may be true.

Mr. KUNKEL. So there is now an emergency, whereas then there was not.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say further that I was at Fort Bragg when they were propping up a building with posts. They went out and cut trees and propped up a school building to protect the children. I have been at 50 of our Army posts throughout the United States and I have seen some of the conditions they have to bear there. I believe it would be unjust to allow this item at this particular time.

Mr. KUNKEL. Does the gentleman like to see conditions like that prevail?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KUNKEL) there were—ayes 57, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Acquisition of land, Republic of Panama: So much of the appropriation for the acquisition of land in the Republic of Panama contained in the Supplemental Military Appropriation Act, 1940, and so much of the appropriation for Seacoast Defenses, Panama Canal, contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, as may be required therefor, are hereby made available, in addition to the acquisition of fee simple title to lands, for leasehold or other interests therein, the temporary use thereof, or right pertaining thereto, without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 529): *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized to accept donations of such land, temporary use thereof, or other interest therein, or right pertaining thereto.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 52, line 25, after the word "thereto" and the period, insert a new paragraph under the head "Finance Department," to read as follows:

"FINANCE DEPARTMENT

"Pay of the Army, 1939: Not to exceed \$60,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head in the Military Appropriation Act, 1939, is hereby made available until June 30, 1940, for the construction and installation of a sewage-treatment plant on the Fort Niagara Military Reservation, N. Y., as authorized by the act of June 20, 1939 (Public, No. 136, 76th Cong.)."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I outlined this amendment at considerable length during the general debate. This amendment does not provide for an appropriation but takes advantage of an unexpended balance. It permits the War Department to construct and install a sewage-treatment plant for the use of the War Department and the adjoining town of Niagara. It would also be to the advantage of the War Department in that it would make possible the consummation of an agreement whereby the village of Youngstown next to this post would pay an annual fee to the Government as a part of its contribution for the use and maintenance of this sewage disposal plant.

If this provision is not in this bill, as it was in the subcommittee report, if it is not adopted at the present time, it will be impossible to complete this agreement and the War Department will be obliged to build this sewage-disposal

plant next year without any revenue being derived from the adjoining town of Youngstown.

I hope the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who indicated to me that he would accept the amendment, and the gentleman from New York feel so disposed at the present time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again I have to ask the Committee to vote down an amendment. First, may I say I did not know anything about this amendment until it came before the subcommittee. The gentleman who offered the amendment never spoke to me about it. However, that would not be so bad, but what I said about the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], with reference to the Carlisle Barracks, also applies to this case.

There are perhaps 10 to 15 Army posts, some of them outlying posts, that have poor water facilities and sewer facilities, and I believe it would be unjust and unfair to many of my colleagues whom we have turned down from time to time, because we did not have the money, to allow this item at this time. If we could provide all the Army posts with the proper kind of sewer systems, the proper kind of housing, the proper kind of hospitals, and the proper kind of gymnasiums, well and good; but inasmuch as if Congress had adjourned a month ago, when we perhaps should have adjourned, this would never have come up, so I am asking you to let the item go over until next year, when the committee can take it up and give it the consideration that should be given to this item along with other items of a similar nature.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman realize that the President of the United States and the Secretary of War have strongly recommended this installation, inasmuch as it is a part of the Niagara River and the international boundary stream, concerning which agreements have been reached with Canada, all other large cities on the river having completed sewage-treatment plants? The War Department will be obligated to build its own plant next year unless it goes in on this agreement, and in addition will get no income from that plant.

Mr. SNYDER. I know that the President and Secretary of War and the rest of them perhaps are in favor of this item but, under the conditions, I ask the Committee to vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS) there were—ayes 35, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigation and survey of a canal and highway across the Republic of Nicaragua: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to an investigation and survey, with estimates of cost, for a barge canal and highway project across the Republic of Nicaragua, fiscal year 1940, to remain available until expended, \$100,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 53, line 18, strike out the entire paragraph to and including line 23.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an utterly useless expenditure of the people's money. It is only \$100,000, but it means a start on a program that will run into a lot of money. It provides for a survey of a barge canal 10 to 12 feet deep, not deep enough or large enough to carry ships, across Nicaragua. It seems to me that this is one of the



most foolish things we could embark upon at this time. It is entirely outside of our own country, in a place where we have no interests, and where we would be doing this as a favor entirely for the other country.

If we are going to do all the surveying for other countries and spend our money there, it seems to me we have come to the end of our rope. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did not this body yesterday afternoon authorize \$277,000,000 for the expansion of the Panama Canal?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but that is in territory that is under our control absolutely.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Budget estimate for this item was \$200,000. The committee cut it in half. The situation is that the President, upon the occasion of the recent visit to America of the President of Nicaragua, made some commitments as a gesture of friendship and good will toward that country with respect to securing the assistance of the Army engineers in simply making this survey for Nicaragua. The State Department is very much interested in having it done. It is a very small item and does not commit the Government to anything beyond the survey which is to be made by the Army engineers.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia) there were—ayes 82, noes 96.

So, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to and including page 54, line 6.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the balance of the bill is title II, made up entirely of judgments and authorized claims about which there is no controversy or amendments to be offered. I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill may be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7462), the third deficiency appropriation bill, fiscal year 1939, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back with an amendment striking out from line 18, page 53, to line 23, page 53.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

#### PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 4998) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act 1921, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi calls up a conference report and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain this?

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, we passed an amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act, known as H. R. 4998. It included only uniform rate provisions. The bill went to the Senate and the Senate placed an amendment on the bill with reference to a certificate. A conference was asked. We have had the conference and the Senate has yielded and the amendment of the Senate has been eliminated. The conference report is exactly as the House passed the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the conferees.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4998) entitled "An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

WALL DOXEY,  
R. M. KLEBERG,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

G. M. GILLETTE,  
W. J. BULOW,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H. R. 4998 submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as it passed the House contained but one section, which would make it mandatory that marketing rates and charges prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture as just and reasonable shall be observed as both the maximum and minimum to be charged and collected from livestock producers.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained an additional section, providing that no person not now conducting the business of a stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer shall conduct such business at any stockyards at which he is not now conducting such business, unless and until he has obtained a certificate from the Secretary that public convenience and necessity requires the conduct of such business.

The action of the conferees is to retain in the bill the first section, as approved by the House, and to eliminate the second section, added by the Senate.

WALL DOXEY,  
R. M. KLEBERG,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### BONNEVILLE PROJECT

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7270, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7270, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection?

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GAVAGAN, Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. SEGER, and Mr. CARTER.

#### MATO CIBILIC ET AL.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 796, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 796, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON.

#### EMIL FRIEDRICH DISCHLEIT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit, with a House amendment, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON.

#### KONSTANTINOS DIONYSIOU ANTIOHOS (OR GUS PAPPAS)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1538) for the relief of Konstantinos Dionysiou Antiohos (or Gus Pappas), with a House amendment, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON.

#### MRS. PACIOS PIJUAN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON.

#### DAUMIT TANNAUS SALEAH (DAVE THOMAS)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1911) for the

relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas), with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON.

#### BENNO VON MAYRHAUSER AND OSKAR VON MAYRHAUSER

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6546) for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out all after "effect", down to and including "States" in line 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ARMISTICE DAY, HOLIDAY FOR CLERKS IN RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4322) giving clerks in the Railway Mail Service the benefit of the holiday known as Armistice Day, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 8, insert: "That this act shall become effective as of October 1, 1939."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on reciprocal-trade treaties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO TRANSMIT INFORMATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I submitted an adverse report on the resolution (H. Res. 232) requesting the President to transmit information to the House of Representatives, House Calendar No. 127, on July 5, 1939. On that date the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] asked that the matter go over on account of the absence of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

I now call up the resolution and ask that it be tabled.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I decline to yield. I am sorry.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 232

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to transmit forthwith to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, such information as may be in his possession or in the files of the State Department which indicates that actual war is imminent between certain countries on the continent of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to table the resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? We get so little information from the State Department.

Mr. BLOOM. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry.



The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 76, noes 64.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to make an announcement.

#### THE LATE HON. ROYAL C. JOHNSON

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise at this time to announce the death today of the Honorable Royal C. Johnson, for 18 years one of the distinguished Members of this House of Representatives, the longest service any South Dakotan has had in either body of the National Congress.

Royal Johnson was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress and served continuously through the Seventy-second Congress, after which he retired voluntarily. He resumed the practice of law, establishing himself here in Washington, where he has been a valued friend and counselor to those of us who have come after him.

In the Sixty-fifth Congress Royal Johnson voted against the declaration of war, yet, loyal American that he was, he offered to give up his seat in this body to join those whom Congress sent to the colors. He enlisted as a private; he rose to a first lieutenant as a line officer. He was wounded in action in the Meuse-Argonne. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and the Croix de Guerre with a star. He was really a great South Dakotan and a great American.

Royal Johnson was not an old man when he died, although he went through a world of physical suffering growing out of wounds and exposure. He covered all that with a smile and with a tireless activity. The world never knew; it only marveled at his ability to work and at his vision and at his interest in a wide range of affairs.

Last winter Royal was struck by a car and received injuries that confined him to a bed for weeks, but he never complained. To him disaster was only an impostor.

He was up here on the Hill a few weeks ago when his portrait was unveiled by the national commander of the American Legion and presented by friends to the rooms of the Veterans' Committee of which he was the first chairman. He was still on crutches from last winter's accident but he talked with characteristic courage of the things he was doing again and how soon he would "throw the sticks away." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, the one that came this morning, by a strange coincidence, carries the account of those proceedings under the extension of remarks by the present committee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, who is out of the city today.

Yesterday Royal was at his office downtown. Members here talked with him. This morning he suffered an unexpected heart attack and passed away. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery Friday, with services in the chapel at Fort Myer at 10 o'clock, conducted by the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, the Chaplain of the House.

He loved his country. He served his country in peace as well as in war. Those of us who knew him and knew his vigorous Americanism and the great service he gave as a statesman in time of peace, as a soldier in time of war, and as chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will always honor his memory.

Members will be interested in a brief factual record of his life, which I will insert at this point:

Royal C. Johnson, Republican, of Aberdeen, was born in Cherokee, Iowa, October 3, 1882; removed to Highmore, S. Dak., March 19, 1883; attended public schools of Highmore and Pierre; Yankton Academy and College in 1901-1903; law degree from South Dakota University in 1906; deputy State's attorney of Hyde County, 1906-1908, and State's attorney, 1908-1909; attorney general of South Dakota in 1911-1914; removed to Aberdeen in May 1913; married Miss Florence Thode and has two sons, Everett Royal and Ensign

Harlan Thode, United States Navy; was elected to the Sixty-fourth Congress to succeed Hon. C. H. Burke, who was not a candidate for reelection; enlisted in the Regular Army, January 4, 1918; assigned to Company K, Three Hundred and Thirteenth Infantry; assigned third officers' training camp, Camp Meade; sergeant, Company K, Three Hundred and Thirteenth Infantry, April 23, 1918; second lieutenant, June 1, 1918; assigned to Company D, Three Hundred and Thirteenth Infantry; embarked for France with Seventy-ninth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, July 6, 1918; first lieutenant, September 3, 1918; assigned to Company D, Three Hundred and Thirteenth Infantry; awarded Distinguished Service Cross and Croix de Guerre; returned, December 17, 1918; reelected to the Sixty-fifth, Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eight, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, and Seventy-second Congresses; was not a candidate for reelection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it is with unfeigned grief that I learned of the sudden death of a distinguished and honored predecessor, Hon. Royal C. Johnson, who served in this House for 18 years with great distinction. He passed to his reward in this city this morning. His service covered the period from the Sixty-fourth to the Seventy-second Congresses, inclusive (March 4, 1915, to March 3, 1933), when he retired voluntarily. During the Sixty-fifth Congress our country entered the World War. Mr. Johnson was one of 51 Members of the House who courageously voted against the war declaration. Nevertheless, with typical sincerity of purpose, he enlisted in the military service of this Republic and went to the front in France. He resigned from this body that he might better serve his country in the Army, but his resignation was not accepted. He was successively promoted from private to first lieutenant, and for conspicuous bravery was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and the Croix de Guerre. Lieutenant Johnson was severely wounded at the Meuse-Argonne and will carry many honorable scars to his grave.

Upon his return to this House he was received with acclaim. He became prominently identified with the American Legion and with other veterans' organizations. It was through his initiative and efforts that the Committee on World War Legislation was created, of which committee he was chairman until the end of the Seventy-first Congress. He originated much legislation beneficial to World War veterans and their dependents. His passing is a great loss to his comrades.

After 18 years of service he retired voluntarily from Congress to practice law in this city. Just a few weeks ago it was my pleasure, as it was also of many Members, to attend a ceremony in the rooms of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at which time the portrait of Royal Johnson was hung there as the first of a series of what will undoubtedly become a long line of prominent chairmen. I want to take just a moment to quote a few words spoken by Royal Johnson at that time, which seemed to have an almost prophetic tinge:

This is an occasion which can never happen twice in the life of any man, and the expressions of the commander and the chairman of the committee concerning the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and my connection with that work between 1923 and 1931, savor much of the reading of one's own obituary. Perhaps it is much like a decoration awarded posthumously.

Mr. Speaker, it is by a most strange coincidence that these remarks of Royal C. Johnson appear in the RECORD which reached our desks this very day. I hope you will all read the entire proceedings of this unveiling ceremony, which appear as the extension of remarks of the Honorable JOHN RANKIN, present chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as they show clearly that those who knew Royal Johnson best did not wait until after his passing to laud his sterling qualities but were most sincere in their praise of this fine friend and splendid statesman while he was yet among us to receive this testimony.

Only 57 years old at the time of his death, Mr. Johnson has left his impress upon the records of Congress as a wise legislator, and upon his many friends as a lovable character. It may be truthfully said of him that as far as his widespread influence extended he left the world better than he

found it as a result of the many kindly and patriotic deeds of the 57 busy years of his distinguished career which today came to such an untimely close.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Had Mr. Johnson chosen to remain in Congress up until this morning he would have held the position I now hold on this committee. Under the Republican administration he served as chairman from January 18, 1924, Sixty-eighth Congress, until he retired from Congress.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress who served with Royal C. Johnson in this House, and everybody who ever met or knew him is deeply shocked today by the news of his sudden passing. The veterans of the World War have lost a comrade who was a true friend and a staunch defender of their interests and rights. He was the first chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation when that committee was formed in 1924. Prior to that time legislation pertaining to veterans' affairs was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The World War veterans wanted a committee of their own because of the many other duties of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The House leadership agreed to the formation of the committee with the understanding that Royal Johnson would become its head, because they knew of his courage, that he was a loyal fighter in the welfare of the veteran and that their interests would be in safe hands under his guidance. It was my great privilege to be appointed to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation when I came to Congress in 1925, and with the exception of the chairman of the committee, I am the only person who served under Royal Johnson's leadership still on the committee. I had been very active in veterans' matters during the war and the period after the Armistice. I had an opportunity to watch Royal Johnson's fine ability, his courage, and his understanding of the many and complex problems facing the veteran. Under his guidance many important pieces of legislation beneficial to the veterans were enacted into law—permanent total disability compensation was raised from \$80 to \$100 per month, the first big hospitalization program was started, in fact the very groundwork of our present-day veterans law was formulated under his direction.

After a group of World War veterans in Congress, headed by Hon. Royal C. Johnson, petitioned Congress to establish a committee to handle the affairs of World War veterans, and through his efforts the foundation for the present compensation system was established. This committee worked hand in hand with groups of service men on a nonpartisan basis and, through the efforts of the chairman, who, at all times had the veterans' interest at heart, was able to consolidate various veteran agencies under one head, which is now known as the Veterans' Administration.

During Mr. Johnson's chairmanship, the compensation laws were enacted, changing from the old pension system to the present system whereby World War veterans now suffering from service-connected disabilities receive compensation, based upon their pre-war occupational handicap. The far-sightedness in establishing a hospital program in 1925, which has endeavored to keep abreast of the ever-increasing load of veterans needing hospitalization, places this country in the lead so far as the treatment of veterans is concerned. Today, as a result of this far-sighted program, there are 84 hospitals throughout the United States with competent staffs who care for over 64,000 veterans annually.

Vocational-training laws were enacted during Mr. Johnson's chairmanship, disability-allowance laws, a portion of which have been repealed by the Economy Act, insurance laws benefitting veterans were liberalized, and a guardianship service was established, in order that those veterans mentally disabled could have adequate protection.

His active service during the war, in which he was wounded and for which he was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, gave him an understanding and sympathy for the problems of the men with whom he served. We shall miss him greatly, for his advice and counsel was invaluable. To his family goes the deep sympathy of all of his friends. A gallant soldier, a great fighter for every cause in which he believed, has gone to his rest.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say that I have been deeply shocked and grieved at the death of my good friend Royal Johnson. Having served with him on the Veterans' Committee when I first came to the Congress, I found him always to be a considerate, courageous, honorable gentleman, and he was largely responsible for many of the finest pieces of legislation to benefit the veterans that have ever been passed by the Congress of the United States.

I sympathize with his family, and I deplore his sudden death.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, as the only surviving member of the War Investigating Committee, I desire to join in the words of commendation that have been expressed here today for Mr. Royal Johnson. As I recall, Mr. Johnson was the eleventh man of the 15 members of that committee to pass away. I happen to be the only survivor in the House of the War Investigating Committee of 15. May I say that Mr. Johnson was a vigorous, upstanding, virile, 100-percent American citizen and he is worthy of everything that has been said of him today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that words cannot properly express that I have heard of the death of our beloved friend and former colleague Hon. Royal C. Johnson. I join in the remarks that have been previously made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Royal Johnson, or "Royal," as we called him, was one of the finest characters that I have ever met or will ever meet. It was a few days ago that I saw him, at which time he appeared to be enjoying excellent health. His death is a shock to his many friends.

One of the first Members that I met when I first became a Member of this body was our late distinguished and beloved friend. From the outset, although of different political faith, he took a deep and personal interest in me. Between us a strong friendship developed, a friendship which I appreciated and valued. A constructive legislator, always fighting the cause of the weak, the memory of his sincerity, his loyalty, and devotion to his country and his friends will always remain with us who had the honor and the pleasure of knowing this fine, sterling character. He exemplified everything that was high and noble in life. Our deepest sympathy is extended to his wife and his children in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, when the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created, largely through the efforts of Royal C. Johnson, it was thought that there should be in its membership some men who had not served in the World War and would be likely to represent the point of view of the public at large. So Homer Snyder, of New York, and I were put on the committee. For the next 10 years I sat with Royal Johnson.

There were those who feared that however well intentioned he might be, his own service would bias him to the benefit of his comrades at the front and to the harm of the public welfare. That fear proved to have no basis whatever. He was preeminently fair. No suspicion of prejudice marred his record. He gave the veterans everything he believed to be their due. He opposed everything that seemed to him not called for by reasoned generosity. So he won the confidence of his committee associates and in turn that of the House.

He was not only a fair man. He was a wise man, a sincere man, a courageous man, a true patriot.

In the war itself and then several times afterward he learned the bitter lessons of pain. They did not harden



his nature. They left him more kindly in his contacts with his fellows. So their admiration turned into affection. They regret his untimely death, but they grieve at the loss of a friend.

**TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST TO THE YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.**

Mr. DEBOUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4635) to transfer certain lands from the Sierra National Forest to the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DEBOUEN]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I take this opportunity to ask the majority leader what the program will be for tomorrow, or the rest of the week and the following week?

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say to the gentleman that within the last few minutes it has been decided that tomorrow there will be a vote on the rule making in order the so-called housing bill, unless the plans are changed, and I do not think they will be.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What will we take up after that?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is all I know of for tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. After the rule is disposed of, there will be nothing further?

Mr. RAYBURN. There may be some conference reports and other matters.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No other rule?

Mr. RAYBURN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DEBOUEN]?

There was no objection.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY**

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the so-called barter bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

**COMMITTEE ON LABOR**

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 1234) to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is that bill?

Mrs. NORTON. That is the telephone bill, so-called. It is a bill for the benefit of the rural telephones throughout the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it the purpose of the lady to bring that up tomorrow?

Mrs. NORTON. I hope to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the bill which exempts Puerto Rico from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act?

Mrs. NORTON. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us about the rest of the wage-hour legislation?

Mrs. NORTON. We have no legislation other than the bill that was reported by the committee, to be brought up under suspension of the rules. That is the only bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There are three bills around here.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that the chairman of the committee has not asked for a rule on any of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is not pressing for consideration of that rule?

Mrs. NORTON. Definitely not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on tomorrow I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes on the deplorable milk condition that exists in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and in one to include an article by Raymond Clapper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. LANDIS asked and were given permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from U. G. Robinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 60 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was unavoidably prevented from being present when the rule on the lending bill was under consideration. I should like the RECORD to show that if I had been present I would have voted in favor of the rule.

**PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE**

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 60 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak with reference to House Resolution 232, which I introduced on June 23 and which has just been tabled. This resolution requested the President of the United States to transmit to the House of Representatives if not incompatible with the public interest such information as may be in the possession or in the files of the State Department which indicates that actual war is imminent between certain countries on the continent of Europe. We have been in session 7 months and the President and the State Department have not given us any real information regarding this subject. I have been in Washington since 1913 and in Congress since 1925. I was in a position before my election to Congress during the years spent in Washington, to learn a great deal regarding the action taken by the State Department and the Congress regarding our foreign affairs and for a number of years I have been a member of the great Foreign Affairs Committee. At no time has the De-

partment of State given to members of the Foreign Affairs Committee so little of their valuable information regarding our foreign affairs. It shakes our confidence and it was of grave concern to me and I believe to all Members of the House when the President made veiled threats as to the imminence of war in foreign countries. And yet we have received from the administration no real details in their possession as to the imminence of any war between the countries on the continent of Europe. It is my belief that the Foreign Affairs Committee in particular should be kept in the confidence of the Department of State regarding matters that vitally affect all the people and the peace and the economic well-being of the United States.

Today the passing of Royal L. Johnson, the former chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, a World War veteran, badly disabled by the war, gives us fresh cause to do our utmost to govern this country's international affairs wisely, to make every effort to keep this country out of entangling alliances, and to prevent our men from fighting on foreign soil again.

If this country were engaged in a great World War, the Congress would be in continuous session. We should stay in continuous session to guard against a repetition of 1917. If war is imminent in Europe we should stay in continuous session, and I introduced a resolution on June 23 for this purpose. Also we have many measures which Congress should consider in an effort to put our people back to work and to bring prosperity to our country. Wise legislation and the repeal of certain laws would help greatly in securing additional opportunities for the farmers, the workers, and the investors. The country today looks to Congress for help.

My concurrent resolution states concerning the report that the President of the United States said at a press conference on June 20, 1939:

If Congress goes home without enacting new neutrality legislation, and if a war broke out in the meantime, it would be difficult to pass any sort of measure without leaving the United States open to charges that it was favoring one side or another.

It is also reported that the President said:

Therefore it would be to Congress' own advantage to insure itself against getting into any such dilemma.

If the President was correctly reported, such remarks clearly indicate that in his opinion based upon information in his possession, but of which Congress and the American people are not apprised, that war in foreign countries is imminent and liable soon to break out. My concurrent resolution provides first that it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that, regardless of the enactment of any pending so-called neutrality legislation, the Congress ought to remain in continuous session in order to be in readiness to meet any eventuality that may arise that would require the exercise of its authority as representatives of the people, and second, the Congress ought to remain in continuous session to solve the unemployment problem and put people back to work, thus ending the business depression. I want the passage of my resolution.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT LOSSES IN SHIPMENT ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6614) to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 6, line 21, strike out all after "Board," down to and including "part," in line 25, and lines 1 to 4, inclusive, on page 7, and insert "including instruments issued by any corporation or other entity owned or controlled by the United States, the funds of which are deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States or deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, but does not include money, coins, or currency of the United States; as used in subsection (d) of this section it means such an instrument drawn by a duly authorized officer or employee of the Post Office Department."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record with reference to the Senate amendment just concurred in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, upon the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Senate amended H. R. 6614 as it passed the House so that duplicate checks of the Government corporations and other entities owned or controlled by the United States will be controlled and approved in the same manner as is the issuance of duplicate checks of the United States. Under existing law a duplicate check of the United States, with certain minor exceptions, is issued only after the owner or holder of the lost check has given the United States a bond of indemnity to protect the United States from any possible loss, but the corporations are not required to receive such a bond of indemnity as a condition precedent to the issuance of duplicate checks. Duplicate checks of corporations are issued pursuant to the rules and regulations adopted by the boards of directors of the corporations. Since the funds of the majority of the Government corporations are either deposited and covered into the United States Treasury or deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, there would appear no reason why any distinction should be made in the class of checks for which indemnity is provided so long as such checks are drawn on and are payable by the Treasurer of the United States.

The Treasury Department, which will have the duty of administering the issuance of duplicate checks if the amendment is adopted, has no objection to the amendment.

#### UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the deplorable condition in the United States with respect to un-American activities apparently has not been corrected by the Dies committee and conditions have been going from bad to worse day after day.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those speaking in tribute of the late Royal C. Johnson today be permitted to extend and revise their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a statement by Mr. Landry on the Philippine and Cuban sugar situation published in the Sugar Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today in Committee of the Whole and to include therein a letter written by the President to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.



Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a resolution of one page which I have introduced today, and two letters I have written to the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill today, it is quite appropriate, I think, for me to call the attention of this House to the deficiencies and inefficiencies of one of the major agencies of the Government. Too much time is consumed in making additional money available to the departments, bureaus, and agencies and not enough time is given to determining how governmental losses in the operations of these agencies may be avoided.

I am today introducing a resolution to provide for an auditing of all accounts and an investigation of the operations of the Home Owners Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of this resolution incorporated in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives, one of whom he shall designate as chairman, for the purpose of conducting an investigation of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

That said committee forthwith conduct an investigation into all acts of said Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and all officials thereof, to determine and fix responsibility for any irregularities of administration and any acts of nonfeasance, misfeasance, or malfeasance on the part of any official, employee, or agency thereof.

That said committee shall cause to be made a complete audit of all accounts of the said Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to determine the extent to which (1) losses have been sustained and are likely to be sustained and reasons therefor, (2) moneys have been unlawfully diverted and expended, and (3) "nonadministrative" funds have been used for "administrative" purposes.

That said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act throughout the continuance of the Seventy-sixth Congress, at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it has been frequently indicated in the public press and stated on this floor that the officials of these Corporations and the Board have been guilty of dereliction of duties, irregularities, and misconduct. The time has long since arrived when we should make a complete investigation of all these charges and have some accounting of the vast expenditures made by the officials of these Corporations. All the information that has come to me forces me reluctantly to the conclusion that the taxpayers stand to lose hundreds of millions of dollars because of mismanagement and irregularities. I feel compelled to introduce a resolution for an investigation. It is the only means by which we can get all the facts. Until there is a thorough investigation, there will be alibis and alibiing propaganda to any criticism we make in Congress.

On June 19 I pointed out, from the records of the General Accounting Office, how officials of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were traveling around the country for purely pleasure and personal business purposes, charging the Government for the transportation. Mr. Fallon, one of these officials, will no doubt have an elaborate alibi to my statement and General Accounting Office records.

Friends of mine, officials of savings and loan associations, have advised me that whenever any kind of a meeting or convention is held there are more Federal officials and employees present than any others. As a matter of fact, John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board itself, probably spends more time away from Washington than at his office. At least, I have received any number of complaints from those having business with the Board Chairman to the effect that they rarely find him in Washington.

Incidentally, I know Mr. Fahey is an executor and trustee of the Edward A. Filene estate in Boston, and, presumably, his work in handling that estate of several million dollars accounts for the fact that he is invariably absent from Washington on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, and sometimes Monday and Tuesday. I do not know to what extent the taxpayers and H. O. L. C. borrowers are paying for his transportation, but I do know they are not getting the benefit of his full service. If that is the situation, it is quite understandable why millions of dollars of the people's money will be lost because of faulty and irregular practices.

Mr. Fahey, the Chairman of the Board, is either overlooking or deliberately ignoring chapter 522, section 17, of the act of July 22, 1932, which provides specifically as follows:

Each member shall devote his entire time to the business of the Board. Before entering upon his duties each of the members shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office.

(See U. S. C., title 12, sec. 1437.)

I am making no complaint against the purpose of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. I recognize, as does every Member of Congress, that it has afforded relief to thousands of worthy citizens. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress and the people should know how politics entered into the administration of this law and the extent to which losses will be sustained because of mismanagement.

I am informed that untold amounts are now being spent to conceal the irregularities and mistakes, all in preparation for a possible investigation by Congress. It is thus imperative that we conduct this investigation without delay. The information I have is not mere rumor or hearsay. It comes from reliable sources, from those who are acquainted with every phase of the financial operations of the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation.

From time to time recommendations have been made within the H. O. L. C. organization to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for improving the accounting methods to prevent any improper diversion of funds. Those recommendations have been entirely ignored. Failure to give consideration to them and the careless do-not-care, easy-going attitude of Chairman Fahey has permitted a continuance of the lax methods and the resultant squandering of millions of dollars.

The most outstanding example of mismanagement of the H. O. L. C. is to be found in what is known as the original New York region, comprising the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. In this region and the State of Massachusetts it has been estimated that the Government will lose approximately \$100,000,000. This loss will be suffered for no other reason than that politics entered into the selection of the personnel and politics entered into the making of loans and appraisals. This loss of \$100,000,000, unless perchance there should be a remarkable improvement in the real-estate market, is the direct result of excessive property appraisals by politicians.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I addressed to Hon. John H. Fahey, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board,

under date of July 26, 1939, and a copy of another letter to him under date of July 28, 1939.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters follow:

JULY 26, 1939.

HON. JOHN H. FAHEY,  
Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FAHEY: Originating at sources which I believe to be reliable, certain assertions have been made to me indicating mismanagement of the H. O. L. C. under your administration which, unless successfully contradicted, deserve extensive investigation to verify and determine responsibility for such alleged irregularities.

(A) It is alleged that at the close of lending operations the national average of mortgage-refinancing loans was approximately \$3,000 for each loan, whereas the individual loan in the States comprising the original New York region average about twice such amount, and the disparity is accentuated by elimination of the said region in computing the national average above referred to. Please furnish me at once with a statement reflecting the number and aggregate dollar value of loans refinanced by the H. O. L. C. in all States, exclusive of States comprising the original New York region, and for comparison the number and aggregate dollar value of loans refinanced in each of the States in the said region. Extension should be made to reflect the average per loan. Further, in this connection, please furnish corresponding information regarding the number and aggregate dollar value of loans refinanced in the State of Massachusetts for comparison with the national average, exclusive of States comprising the original New York region, together with the State of Massachusetts.

(B) It is alleged that the number of properties repossessed from owners under foreclosure proceedings in the States comprising the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts are excessive in relation to the number of refinancing loans in such States at the close of lending operations, when compared with corresponding repossession ratios in all other States, exclusive of the particular States referred to. Please furnish me at once with a statement reflecting the number of loans refinanced in each of the States in the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts at the close of lending operations, together with the number of repossessions under foreclosure proceedings (completed or in process) at the end of a recent month, compared with the number of loans refinanced and similar repossessions in all other States as of corresponding date.

(C) It is alleged that projected repossessions under foreclosure proceedings because of prevailing delinquencies in the States comprising the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts accentuate the disparity in the completed or in process of foreclosure ratio comparison above referred to. Please furnish me at once with a statement reflecting the number of loans delinquent in respect to principal and/or interest for more than 1 year in each of the States comprising the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts compared with corresponding delinquencies in all other States at the end of a recent month.

(D) It is alleged that losses from disposition of the acquired properties in the States comprising the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts are excessive in relation to corresponding losses in all other States. Please furnish me at once with a statement reflecting the number and aggregate ledger values of acquired properties (showing break-down between foreclosures completed and in process) in each of the States comprising the original New York region and in the State of Massachusetts, cumulative to the end of a recent month, together with the number of dispositions of such acquired properties and aggregate proceeds of sales prices (disregarding terms thereof) indicating aggregate and average losses sustained, cumulative to the end of corresponding recent month. In this connection, please advise me the basis of computing ledger values and indicate if losses sustained include all sales commissions to brokers.

(E) It is alleged that the number of personnel employed in the original New York regional office and in each of the State offices (comprising that region) from the inception of lending operations all through November 30, 1936, was disproportionately large in comparison with corresponding personnel in other regional and State offices after taking into consideration incidents of work load differentials. Please furnish me at once with a statement reflecting the number of personnel employed in the State offices comprising the original New York region, together with the regional office at the end of each month during the calendar year 1936, compared with the number of personnel employed in the Illinois and Michigan State offices and in the Chicago and Detroit regional offices for the corresponding periods. It is not necessary to show break-down by departments of these various offices. Further, in this connection, please show for comparison the number of personnel in each of the above offices as of March 31, 1937, following the election.

If my requests for these statements are subject to more than one interpretation, please prepare and submit at once statements giving effect to both interpretations. If exact figures are not available, statements reflecting approximations will fit my requirements.

LXXXIV—686

Should this communication be received at your office during your absence, I will appreciate the issuance of instructions for immediate compliance.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

JULY 28, 1939.

HON. JOHN H. FAHEY,  
Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FAHEY: Supplementing my letter of July 26, reference is made to paragraph "(D)" and it is noted that I omitted to request similar data relating to acquisition of properties and dispositions thereof in States other than the original New York region and the State of Massachusetts, for comparison.

This supplemental request is being transmitted to your office by messenger and I will appreciate your immediate attention thereto coincident with my letter of July 26.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois made some very pertinent remarks on the floor of the House sometime ago, and I ask him if he knows that some of the so-called executives, if you please, or, to use the common vernacular, the "big shots" of the H. O. L. C. and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, have said that there is nothing to fear from this, that there will be no investigation, and that this matter will blow over? They are in effect laughing at the Congress of the United States. Does the gentleman from Illinois understand that?

Mr. CHURCH. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman realize the significance of their statement, that is, that they have contempt for the gentleman from Illinois and every other Member of Congress, and that they will pursue their own game in their own way and that they do not care for interference?

Mr. CHURCH. That is the point that I am trying to make.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has the gentleman from Illinois any idea as to the number of board meetings the chairman has attended?

Mr. CHURCH. I understand they are very few, but it is difficult to obtain that information. Only an investigation will bring those things out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would suggest to the gentleman who has shown such an interest in this, which is a good thing for American Government, to secure that information.

Mr. CHURCH. I will say that thorough investigation by this Congress will get that information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman believes that investigation is necessary?

Mr. CHURCH. I am positive. So are many Members of the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee established a fine record of service over a period of 5 years as general counsel for the H. O. L. C. for his State of Tennessee and I thank him for his contribution. Let me say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that this matter should be pursued at this session and during the vacation period. There should be no let up and if necessary at the next session of this Congress, when it meets in January, it should be followed up. The delay is costly. A thorough investigation must finally be had—the sooner the better. Again I say that there must be no let up.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Has the gentleman any hope that we will have an investigation until after the 1940 election?



Mr. CHURCH. This resolution will enable an investigation of these matters now, and if they do not investigate, of course we will in 1940. There should be a nonpartisan, thorough investigation now.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. After 1941 we will have to have a housing program to put additions to the penitentiaries at Leavenworth and other places.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to say for myself, as well as for certain other members of my party, that there are certain of us in this body who invite an investigation into the activities of this Board. So that the gentleman from Illinois speaks not only for his party, but for certain of us in our party, as to the necessity and advisability of an investigation into the activities of this Board. [Applause.]

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. [Applause.]

At the moment I do not have a reply to these letters. Today is Wednesday, however, and I suppose Mr. Fahey has not yet returned from another week end in Boston. But even before I get the reply I can tell you what the figures will show. I have thoroughly reliable information on the subject, and it was on a basis of this information that the inquiry to the Chairman of the Board was written.

The true picture can best be presented by comparing the loans, foreclosures, and losses per property in the New York region with that of other States. It has been estimated that the national average of loss per property by the H. O. L. C. will be \$800. But in the New York region alone the estimated loss per property is placed at \$2,000. If we take the New York region out of the national average, the average loss per property outside of New York goes down to \$500. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the average loss per property in the New York region will be four times what it will be outside of that area.

I understand that at the present time the H. O. L. C. in the New York region has something like 37,000 properties on hand to sell. If we take the acquired properties in that region, plus those so delinquent in payments that there is every reason to believe they will go to foreclosure, it will be found that 50 percent of all the loans made in the region will represent a loss. That aggregate loss will total around \$100,000,000.

Why this \$100,000,000 loss in the New York region? Why will the average loss per property be \$2,000 as compared with \$500 outside that area? The answer simply is that the appraisals were excessive; that politics and gross mismanagement played a large part in the appraisals and making of loans.

During the period from 1933 to 1936 a Mr. Vincent Dailey served as H. O. L. C. State manager for New York. Mr. Dailey was also vice chairman of the Democratic State organization. He is a close personal friend of Mr. Farley. And, as the manager in Massachusetts, incidentally, was none other than Dan Le Hand, brother of Marguerite A. Le Hand, personal secretary to the President of the United States, obviously these men, Vincent Dailey and Dan Le Hand, were selected for political reasons and not for their exceptional knowledge of the real-estate business and executive ability. They were the political bigwigs. Both Vincent Dailey and Dan Le Hand, politicians par excellence, allowed property to be appraised on a basis of the vote value rather than on a basis of real-estate values. Mr. Fahey, chairman of the Board, was their political inferior, and he no doubt took that fact in consideration whenever his attention was called to the H. O. L. C. loan situation in the New York region and the State of Massachusetts. The unfortunate part of it all is that the taxpayers will ultimately pay the losses.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the original New York region of the H. O. L. C. and the State of Massachusetts constitute an outstanding example of politics in the H. O. L. C., waste and extravagance. It thus results that the Government is estimated to lose \$100,000,000 on the H. O. L. C. loans in that area, to lose \$2,000 per property as compared with an average loss of \$500 per property outside of New York.

We do not know how many millions of dollars have been squandered by the H. O. L. C.—money which should have gone to relieve the distressed but wasted by the officials. There has been no accounting. We do not know to what extent nonadministrative funds have been diverted into administrative so as to evade the limitation placed by Congress on administrative costs.

Mr. Speaker, I know something like \$100,000,000 will be lost in the New York region because of gross mismanagement. That in itself warrants an investigation. If this administration refuses to bring the facts to light, it will have to bear full responsibility for what will be revealed when the Republican Party makes an investigation in 1941.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at that point, with other remarks about Mr. Royal C. Johnson, some that I will make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKSTEIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows: S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; to the Committee on Labor.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

- H. R. 543. An act for the relief of Imogene Enley;
- H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Bessie Bear Robe;
- H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of William H. Keesey;
- H. R. 1881. An act for the relief of Anne Boice;
- H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Ada Fuller;
- H. R. 2178. An act to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936;
- H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor;
- H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of G. E. Williams;
- H. R. 2610. An act for the relief of G. W. Netterville; and
- H. R. 2642. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2738. An act providing for the disposition of certain Klamath Indian tribal funds;
- H. R. 2750. An act to prohibit the issuance and coinage of certain commemorative coins, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 2875. An act to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter;
- H. R. 2883. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act;
- H. R. 2971. An act for the relief of certain Indians of the Winnebago Agency;
- H. R. 3025. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214-15);
- H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Violet Dewey;
- H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Franklin Lopez, administrator of the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Alice C. Lopez, deceased;
- H. R. 3215. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 536);
- H. R. 3337. An act for the relief of the estate of Arthur Weltner;
- H. R. 3345. An act for the relief of the Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of J. Aristide Lefevre;  
 H. R. 3795. An act to provide a right-of-way through the Chilkoot Barracks Military Reservation, Alaska;  
 H. R. 4008. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of Labor;  
 H. R. 4100. An act to amend the naturalization laws in relation to an alien previously lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence and who is temporarily absent from the United States solely in his or her capacity as a regularly ordained clergyman or representative of a recognized religious denomination or religious organization existing in the United States;  
 H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of W. C. and James Latane, and Willie Johnson;  
 H. R. 4261. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank M. Smith;  
 H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Corabell Wuensch, Jackie Lee Wuensch, and Mary Rainbolt;  
 H. R. 4306. An act to make the United States Coast Guard Academy library a public depository for Government publications;  
 H. R. 4434. An act to provide for the abatement of personal taxes from insolvent building associations in the District of Columbia;  
 H. R. 4609. An act for the relief of Charles Enslow;  
 H. R. 4638. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the eradication and control of the pink bollworm, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 4732. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George M. Corriveau;  
 H. R. 4733. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Laura T. Corriveau;  
 H. R. 4742. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chalmette National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 4783. An act to provide a right-of-way;  
 H. R. 4784. An act to provide a right-of-way;  
 H. R. 4847. An act for the relief of Leland J. Belding;  
 H. R. 4983. An act to amend sections 712, 802, and 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to the requisitioning of vessels;  
 H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of Nicholas Contopoulos;  
 H. R. 5450. An act to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed;  
 H. R. 5516. An act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter;  
 H. R. 5611. An act to amend section 9 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 817), entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes";  
 H. R. 5684. An act amending the act of Congress of June 25, 1938 (C. 710, 52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath Business Committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe;  
 H. R. 5743. An act for the relief of Walter C. Holmes;  
 H. R. 5764. An act to provide for the establishment of a cemetery within the Crab Orchard Creek Dam project, Williamson County, Ill.;  
 H. R. 5775. An act for the relief of Michael M. Cohen;  
 H. R. 5912. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Salt Lake City, Utah, to construct and maintain certain roads, streets, and boulevards across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation;  
 H. R. 5988. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938 (Public Law No. 583, 75th Cong., 3d sess.);  
 H. R. 6114. An act to authorize postmasters within the Territory of Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6266. An act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.;  
 H. R. 6268. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make certain allowances for losses by leakage and evaporation upon withdrawal of packages of brandy or fruit spirits under certain conditions;  
 H. R. 6273. An act to exempt certain motorboats from the operation of sections 4 and 6 of the Motorboat Act of June 9, 1910, and from certain other acts of Congress, and to provide that certain motorboats shall not be required to carry on board copies of the pilot rules;  
 H. R. 6320. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry;  
 H. R. 6405. An act authorizing the sale of certain real estate in the District of Columbia no longer required for public purposes;  
 H. R. 6528. An act to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 6538. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;  
 H. R. 6539. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;  
 H. R. 6540. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;  
 H. R. 6541. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;  
 H. R. 6555. An act to amend the act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374), as amended, relating to the advance of funds in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs, so as to permit such advances in connection with the enforcement of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, and to permit advances of funds in connection with the enforcement of the customs laws;  
 H. R. 6585. An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government;  
 H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of the Arkansas State Penitentiary;  
 H. R. 6872. An act to amend sections 4886, 4887, 4920, and 4929 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 31, 32, 69, and 73);  
 H. R. 6873. An act to amend sections 4904, 4909, 4911, and 4915 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 52, 57, 59a, and 63);  
 H. R. 6875. An act to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51);  
 H. R. 6899. An act granting pensions to certain veterans of the Civil War;  
 H. R. 6925. An act to waive the age limit for appointment as second lieutenant, Regular Army, of certain persons now on active duty with the Air Corps;  
 H. R. 7086. An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia;  
 H. R. 7093. An act to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army;  
 H. R. 7263. An act to permit the importation free of duty of certain literature for distribution at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939;  
 H. R. 7288. An act to perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard by authorizing the commissioning, appointment, and enlistment in the Coast Guard, of certain officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 7320. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, and for other purposes;  
 H. R. 7411. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;  
 H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of the Columbian Fountain in Washington, D. C.;  
 H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge;



H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the delegation of certain authority within the Department of Agriculture;

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover;

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior deferring the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the San Carlos and Flathead Indian irrigation projects;

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the city of Gallipolis, Ohio;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution providing that the farmers' market in blocks 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia shall not be used for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 5. An act to grant certain lands to the Arizona State Elks Association Hospital;

S. 28. An act to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.;

S. 68. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 185. An act to amend section 224 of the Criminal Code so as to penalize the making of false claims for the loss of insured mail matter;

S. 190. An act to authorize the temporary appointment of a special judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands;

S. 432. An act to provide for the public auction of certain town lots within the city of Parker, Ariz.;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Addison B. Hampel;

S. 683. An act for the relief of Fae Banas;

S. 755. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Borg-Warner Corporation;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Hugh McGuire;

S. 808. An act for the relief of Calliope Minaca Pilavakis;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of John B. Jones;

S. 1156. An act to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the military reservation known as the Morehead City Target Range, N. C., for the construction of improvements thereon, and for other purposes;

S. 1211. An act for the relief of Jesse Claud Branson;

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Ernest Clinton and Frederick P. Deragisch;

S. 1258. An act for the relief of the Rent-A-Car Co.;

S. 1282. An act to extend the privilege of retirement for disability to judges appointed to hold office during good behavior;

S. 1322. An act for the relief of Dorothy Clair Hester, daughter of E. R. Hester;

S. 1339. An act for the relief of Grace S. Taylor;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of Allie Holsomback and Lonnie Taylor;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Dorothy Elizabeth Sisson, a minor;

S. 1467. An act for the relief of the Standard Oil Co., Inc., in Kentucky;

S. 1527. An act for the relief of Joseph Lopez Ramos;

S. 1688. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Parse;

S. 1722. An act for the relief of Hannis Hoven;

S. 1773. An act to provide that no statute of limitations shall apply to offenses punishable by death;

S. 1812. An act for the relief of A. E. Bostrom;

S. 1823. An act for the relief of William E. Cowen;

S. 1874. An act to amend the Criminal Code in regard to obtaining money by false pretenses on the high seas;

S. 1882. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Ross;

S. 1901. An act to extend to Sgt. Maj. Leonard E. Browning, United States Marine Corps, the benefits of the act of May 7, 1932, providing highest World War rank to retired enlisted men;

S. 1954. An act for the relief of Joannes Josephus Citron;

S. 1996. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at Astoria, Clatsop County, Oreg.;

S. 2023. An act for the relief of C. L. Herren;

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Joseph Alder, E. G. Allen, and E. G. Allen and By Hanchett jointly;

S. 2061. An act for the relief of William Hillock;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Leslie J. Frane and Charles Frane;

S. 2082. An act for the relief of Hugh A. Smith;

S. 2114. An act for the relief of Virginia Pearson;

S. 2179. An act for the relief of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

S. 2188. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Providence, Warren & Bristol Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Warren River at or near Barrington, R. I.;

S. 2242. An act creating the Memphis and Arkansas Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; and for other purposes;

S. 2245. An act to prohibit the use of the mails for the solicitation of the procurement of divorces in foreign countries;

S. 2275. An act for the relief of Floyd M. Dunscomb;

S. 2306. An act relating to the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the towns of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa;

S. 2366. An act for the relief of Franklin C. Richardson;

S. 2370. An act for the relief of Corinne W. Bienvenu (nee Corinne Wells);

S. 2392. An act to legalize a bridge across Bayou La Fourche at Cut Off, La.;

S. 2407. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Valley and McCone, Mont., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Frazer, Mont.;

S. 2410. An act relating to the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects with funds furnished by the Farm Security Administration;

S. 2454. An act to relieve disbursing officers and certifying officers of the Veterans' Administration from liability for payment where recovery of such payment is waived under existing laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 2484. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

S. 2502. An act authorizing the county of Howard, State of Missouri, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Petersburg, Mo.;

S. 2513. An act for the relief of certain persons whose property was damaged or destroyed as a result of the crashes of two airplanes of the United States Navy at East Braintree, Mass., on April 4, 1939;

S. 2526. An act to authorize Leonhard Stejneger, of the United States National Museum, to accept certain decoration from the Norwegian Government;

S. 2562. An act to facilitate certain construction work for the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2563. An act to legalize a free highway bridge now being constructed across the Des Moines River, at Levy, Iowa;

S. 2564. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Red Rock, Iowa;

N. Y., favoring legislation which would stop the advertising bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at St. Georges, Del.;

S. 2589. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.;

S. 2634. An act to reserve to the United States for the Bonneville project a right-of-way across certain Indian lands in the State of Washington, subject to the consent of the individual allottees and the payment of compensation, and for other purposes;

S. 2738. An act to ratify and confirm Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1939, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

S. 2784. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for the Virgin Islands of the United States," approved June 22, 1936;

S. 2788. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the celebration to be held at Fort McHenry on September 14, 1939, in celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of The Star-Spangled Banner.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 3, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1059. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 24, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cadle Creek, Anne Arundel County, Md. (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1060. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the draft of a bill to allow credit in the accounts of certain former disbursing officers of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7462. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1939, and June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 6424. A bill to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ASHBROOK: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7256. A bill to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 1610. An act to prevent discrimination against graduates of certain schools, and those acquiring their legal education in law offices, in the making of appointments to Government

positions the qualifications for which include legal training or legal experience; with amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 1975. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Acts of March 14, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5435, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HILL: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 6613. A bill authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1989. An act to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KRAMER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7246. A bill for the relief of Madeline Vera Bucholz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7249) to correct the discharge of Kenneth A. Cranmer, and the same was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7463. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for extending aid to producers of lumber and manufactured timber products; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 7464. A bill to prohibit the transportation or receipt of gambling devices in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7465. A bill to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. R. 7466. A bill to amend part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the use of refrigerator cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 7467. A bill providing for alternate structural designs; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 7468. A bill making the 12th day of each October in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 7469. A bill to provide for the subscription by Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the stock of a corporation which is hereby created to finance self-liquidating



express highways which will create additional facilities for national defense, relieve highway-traffic congestion in inter-metropolitan regions, aid air navigation, aid the States, municipalities, and other public authorities thereof, furnish employment for citizens now on relief, decrease unemployment, stimulate business recovery, and promote public safety, to define the powers and limitations of such corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 378. Joint Resolution to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1940; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the consideration of bills making appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. Res. 290. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation of the petroleum industry; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 291. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 290; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Res. 292. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a select committee to investigate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 7470. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Tortora; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7471. A bill for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7472. A bill for the relief of Helge A. Carlson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 7473. A bill granting a pension to John E. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7474. A bill for the relief of Anna Lansinger; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 7475. A bill granting a pension to Maude Fielding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7476. A bill for the relief of Hugh M. Whidden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7477. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nila M. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 7478. A bill for the relief of Antonio Grillo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7479. A bill for the relief of Clara L. Gardiner; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5189. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of Marie Roost and sundry other citizens of Oregon, submitted by the Oregon Workers' Alliance, asking restoration of Works Progress Administration to its former status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5190. By Mr. FISH: Petition signed by Grace L. DuMond and 17 other citizens of Pleasant Valley, Dutchess County,

N. Y., favoring legislation which would stop the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5191. Also, petition signed by Mrs. J. F. Carpenter and 89 other citizens of Middletown, Orange County, N. Y., favoring legislation which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5192. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of Henry Heller, president, United Optical Workers Union, urging that there be no changes in the Wages and Hours Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5193. Also, petition of Legionarios Del Trabajo, New York Lodge, No. 533, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 7239; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5194. Also, petition of James A. Ulrich, executive director, American Federation of Housing Authorities, urging enactment of Senate bill 591, during this session of the Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5195. Also, petition of Social Service Employees' Union, representing 2,000 members, opposing the proposed amendment to the Social Security Act, which would exclude insurance agents on commission, thereby jeopardizing the status of 90,000 industrial agents now covered by the act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5196. Also, petition of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, pertaining to the bill for lending money on self-liquidating projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5197. Also, petition of the International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, urging immediate enactment of House bill 2883, the amendment to the United States Housing Act for 1939, and also the national housing census bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5198. Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, expressing opposition to the Barden amendments to House bill 7133, the Wages and Hours Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5199. Also, petition of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, opposing all pending amendments to weaken the Wages and Hours Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5200. Also, petition of the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, favoring enactment of House bill 7133, the Barden amendments to the Wages and Hours Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5201. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Utility Workers, of New York City, representing 40,000 utility employees of Greater New York, relative to amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5202. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Philippines Post 1164, American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting the enactment of House bill 7239, to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5203. Also, resolution of the New York Lodge 533, Legionarios del Trabajo, respectfully appealing to the Congress to enact House bill 7239, to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5204. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Student Council of Brooklyn High School for Homemaking, urging reinstatement of Works Progress Administration staff of workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5205. Also, petition of the Women's Peace Union, New York City, concerning the foreign policy of the United States and opposing any war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5206. Also, petition of Clark Perry, chairman, legislative committee, Plumbers Union 463, New York City, urging sup-

port of Wagner-Steagall housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5207. Also, petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill., concerning pollution; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5208. Also, petition of lawyers and clerks on workmen's compensation project No. 665-97-3-44, New York City, urging consideration of the Murray amendment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 2, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us out of every kindred and tongue, and dost will that men should live at peace, grant us grace, we beseech Thee, to use the talents of our several races to the strengthening of this Nation, that we may be a united people, zealous for our common good, and free from jealousies and hatreds which divide and despoil us of our heritage. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, August 2, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Andrews	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Ashurst	George	McCarran	Smathers
Austin	Gerry	McKellar	Smith
Bailey	Gibson	Maloney	Stewart
Bankhead	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Bridges	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Brown	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Bulow	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Burke	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Byrd	Holt	Pepper	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Hughes	Pittman	Wagner
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	King	Russell	White
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Schwartz	
Connally	Lee	Schwellenbach	
Danaher	Lodge	Sheppard	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 27, 1939:

S. 1725. An act relating to the acquisition of the site for the post-office building to be constructed in Poplarville, Miss.;

S. 1878. An act to provide for the distribution of the judgment fund of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; and

S. 2170. An act to improve the efficiency of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

On July 28, 1939:

S. 2482. An act authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Rear Admiral Harry Ervin Yarnell, United States Navy.

On July 31, 1939:

S. 770. An act to authorize the addition to Glacier National Park, Mont., of certain property acquired for the establishment of a fish hatchery, and for other purposes; and

S. 1116. An act to amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1460), to permit retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to hold civil office in any Territory of the United States.

On August 2, 1939 (11:50 a. m.):

S. 1871. An act to prevent pernicious political activities.

### VIRGINIA (MERRIMAC)—MONITOR COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Virginia (Merrimac)—Monitor Commission, established under the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 32.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site, and other public purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7270) to amend the Bonneville Project Act; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GAVAGAN, Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. SEGER, and Mr. CARTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Mrs. Pacios Pijuan, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1911) for the relief of Daumit Tannaus Saleah (Dave Thomas), disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 796) for the relief of Mato, Miljenko, Bozo, and Augustin Cibilic, or Zibilich, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Emil Friedrich Dischleit, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.